

REFLECTIONS

ON

Dr. SACHEVERELL'S

ANSWER

To the ARTICLES of

Impeachment,

Exhibited against him by the Honourable

House of Commons

Paragraph by Paragraph.

Ut te neque Hominum neque Deorum pudet, quos perjurio aut perfidia violasti! qui quando talis es maneat in Sententia: Et retineas arma, te hortor: ne prolatandis Seditiōibus inquiet ipse, nos in solitudine retineas. Neque te Provincia, neque leges, neque Dii penates Civem patiuntur. Perge quia capisti. Ut quam maturum merita invenias. Sallust. Oratio L. Philippi contra Lepidum.

Cum prater idoneum ducem, nihil absit ad subvertendum imperium ego vos oro atque obsecro P. C. ut animadvertatis; ne patiamini Licentiam Scelerum quasi rabiem ad integros contactu procedere. Idem ad Senatum Romanum.

L O N D O N :

Sold by B. Bragge, at the Raven in Pater-Noster-Row. 1710.

Impachment.

Exhibited against him by the Honorable

House of Commons

Paragraph by Paragraph.



Ut te neque Hominum neque Deorum
 obsequi! qui quando talis es auctoritas
 doctor: non probantur Speculatione
 tunc. Neque Speculatione, neque leges, neque Dei penitus
 p. tunc. Neque Speculatione, neque leges, neque Dei penitus
 Salust. Quinto I. Philippi contra I. p. tunc.
 Cum praeferat hominem ducem, nihil aliud ad subvertendum imperium
 ovo utque obsequio I. C. ut animalis talis; non p. tunc
 ferum quod rabiem ad interitum contrahit. Item ad Deum
 hominum.

1. 0 M D M

Sold by B. Bunge, at the Auction in Eaton-Place. 1775.

REFLECTIONS

ON

Dr. Sacheverell's Answer, &c.

January 10. 1709.

Articles exhibited by the Knights, Citizens, and Burgeſſes in Parliament Aſſembl'd, in the Name of themſelves, and of all the Commons of Great Britain, againſt Henry Sacheverell, Doctor in Divinity, in Maintenance of their Impeachment againſt him, for High Crimes and Misdemeanours.

WHEREAS his late Maſteſty, King *William the Third*, then Prince of *Orange*, did with an arm'd Force undertake a Glorious Enterprize, for delivering this Kingdom from Popery and arbitrary Power; and divers Subjects of this Realm, well affected to their Country, join'd with, and aſſiſted his late Maſteſty in the ſaid Enterprize: And it having pleas'd Almighty God to crown the ſame with Succeſs, the late happy Revolution did take Effect, and was eſtabliſh'd: And whereas the ſaid Glorious Enterprize is approv'd by ſeveral Acts of Parliament, and amongſt others, by an Act made in the firſt Year of the Reign of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, entitl'd, *An Act declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and ſettling the Succeſſion of the Crown*; and alſo by another Act made in the ſame Year, entitl'd, *An Act for preventing vexatious Suits, againſt ſuch as acted in Order to the bringing in their Maſteſties, or for their Service*; and alſo by one other Act made in the ſame Year, entitl'd, *An Act for appropriating certain Duties for paying the States General of the United Provinces their Charges for his Maſteſty's Expedition into this Kingdom, and for other Uſes*: And the Actings of the ſaid well-affected Subjects, in Aid and Purſuance of the ſaid Enterprize, are alſo declar'd to have been neceſſary, and that the ſame ought to be juſtify'd. And whereas the happy and bleſſed

Right of God's true Religion establish'd among us, and of the Laws and Liberties of the Kingdom, the uniting her Majesty's Protestant Subjects in Interest and Affection, by a legal Indulgence or Toleration granted to Dissenters; the Preservation of her Majesty's Sacred Person; the many and continual Benefits arising from her Majesty's wise and glorious Administration, and the Prospect of Happiness for future Ages, by the Settlement of the Succession of the Crown in the Protestant Line, and the Union of the two Kingdoms. And whereas the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in Parliament assembled, did, by their Address of the 17th of December, 1705, lay before her Majesty the following Vote or Resolution, viz. *That the Church of England, as by Law establish'd, which was rescued from the extreamest Danger by King William the Third, of glorious Memory, is now, by God's Blessing, under the happy Reign of her Majesty, in a most safe and flourishing Condition; and that whoever goes about to suggest and insinuate, that the Church is in Danger under her Majesty's Administration, is an Enemy to the Queen, the Church, and the Kingdom.* And, by their said Address, did humbly beseech her Majesty to take effectual Measures for making the said Vote or Resolution publick; and also for punishing the Authors and Spreaders of such seditious and scandalous Reports. And on the 20th Day of the same December, her Majesty was pleas'd to issue her Royal Proclamation accordingly: Yet nevertheless the said Henry Sacheverell preach'd a Sermon at the Assizes held at Darby, August the 15th, in the Year of our Lord 1709, and afterwards publish'd the same in Print, with a Dedication thereof. And the said Henry Sacheverell also preach'd a Sermon at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, before the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London, on the 5th of November last, being the Anniversary from the Gun-powder-Treason, and for beginning the late happy Revolution, by giving his late Majesty a safe Arrival here, and for completing the same, by making all Opposition fall before him, till he became our King and Governor; which said Sermon, he the said Henry Sacheverell afterwards likewise publish'd in Print, with a Dedication thereof to Sir Samuel Garrard, Baronet, Lord Mayor of the City of London: And with a wicked, malicious, and seditious Intention, to undermine and subvert her Majesty's Government, and the Protestant Succession, as by Law establish'd; to defame her Majesty's Administration; to asperse the Memory of his late Majesty; to traduce and condemn the late happy Revolution; to contradict and arraign the Resolution of both Houses of Parliament; to create Jealousies and Divisions among her Majesty's Subjects; and to incite them to Sedition and Rebellion.

A. R. T. I. C. L. E.

ARTICLE I.

He, the said Henry Sacheverell, in the said Sermon preach'd at St. Paul's, doth suggest and maintain, That the necessary Means us'd to bring about the said happy Revolution, were odious and unjustifiable; that his late Majesty in his Declaration, disclaim'd the least Imputation of Resistance, and that to impute Resistance to the said Revolution, is to cast black and odious Colours upon his late Majesty, and the said Revolution.

The ANSWER of Henry Sacheverell, D. D. to the Articles exhibited by the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses in Parliament assembled, in the Name of themselves, and of all the Commons of Great Britain, in Maintenance of their Impeachment against him, for high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

THE said Henry Sacheverell saying to himself all Advantage of Exception to the said Articles for the Generality, Uncertainty, and Insufficiency thereof; and of not being prejudic'd by any Words, or want of Form in this his Answer, admits That at the Request of George Sacheverell, Esquire, High-Sheriff of the County of Darby, he preach'd a Sermon at the Assizes held for that County on the 15th Day of August, 1709. And that at the Desire of the Right Honourable Sir Samuel Garrard, Barronet, Lord-Mayor of the City of London. He also preach'd a Sermon at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, before the said Lord-Mayor, and the Aldermen, and Citizens of London, on the 5th Day of November last. And that he caus'd the said Sermons to be printed: But denies that he preach'd, or caus'd the same to be printed or publish'd with any such wicked, malicious, or seditious Intent, as in the Preamble of the said Articles is affirm'd. The said Henry Sacheverell having been induc'd to print the Sermon he preach'd at Darby, at the Request of the Gentlemen of the Grand Jury of that County, to whom he humbly presum'd to dedicate the same, as the most publick Acknowledgment he was capable of making, for the peculiar Honour he had receiv'd by their publick Approbation of that Sermon. And the said Lord-Mayor having been pleas'd to express his Good-liking of the said Sermon preach'd at St. Paul's, the said Henry Sacheverell, at his Request, caus'd the same to be printed, with a Dedication thereof to him. And for Answer to the said Articles, humbly saith:

Answer to the first Article.

To the first Part of the first Article, the said Henry Sacheverell denies that in his said Sermon preach'd at St. Paul's, ' he doth suggest and maintain, that the necessary Means us'd to bring about the happy Revolution, were odious and unjustifiable. Nor doth he in any

Part

Part of that Sermon, affirm any Thing concerning the necessary Means us'd to bring about the happy Revolution. The said *Henry Sacheverell* is so far from reflecting on his late Majesty, or the happy Revolution, that he endeavours in that Sermon to clear the Revolution and his late Majesty from the black and odious Colours which their greatest Enemies had endeavour'd to cast upon both.

And as to that Part of the said Article whereby the said *Henry Sacheverell* is charged with the 'suggesting and maintaining, that his late Majesty in his Declaration, disclaim'd the least Imputation of Resistance. The said *Henry Sacheverell* doth acknowledge himself to have made such Suggestion, and declares, that he made it not in Dishonour, but in Vindication of his said Majesty. The Resistance the said *Henry Sacheverell* represents the late King to have disclaim'd, being such a Resistance as tended to the Conquest of this Realm, as plainly appears from that Part of his late Majesty's Declaration, which is referr'd to, and verbatim set forth at the Bottom of the same Page, in which he mentions His Late Majesty's disclaiming any such Imputation.

Whether the said *Henry Sacheverell* was mistaken or not, in expressing himself as if the late King had disclaim'd any Imputation of Resistance, when he the said *Henry Sacheverell* meant thereby, that the Late King disclaim'd the Imputation of a Design of Conquest. He humbly conceives such a Suggestion by him plainly design'd for the Honour of the Late King, cannot in any reasonable Construction, be thought a Reflection on His said Late Majesty, or deem'd any high Crime or Misdemeanour.

For the farther Justification of what the said *Henry Sacheverell* said in reference to His Late Majesty's having disclaim'd any the least Imputation of Resistance; the said *Henry Sacheverell* humbly observes, That in his Late Majesty's Declaration, the following Passages are contain'd, ——— *We have thought fit to go over to England, and to carry over with us a Force sufficient, by the Blessing of God, to defend our selves from the Violence of Evil Counsellors. — We think fit to declare, that this our Expedition is intended for no other Design than to have a Free and Lawful Parliament Assembled.*

As to the last Charge in the said Article, the said *Henry Sacheverell* denies that he doth in the said Sermon suggest and maintain, that to impute Resistance to the said Revolution, is to cast Black and Odious Colours upon his Late Majesty and the said Revolution; the Persons whom the said *Henry Sacheverell* in his Sermon describes, as casting Black and Odious Colours upon His Late Majesty and the Revolution, are not those who impute Resistance to the said Revolution; of whom the said *Henry Sacheverell* affirms nothing but those new Preachers and new Politicians, who teach in contradiction to both Gospel and the Laws, that the People have the Power invested in them; the Fountain and

Original

Original of it, to Cancel their Allegiance at their Pleasure, and to call their Sovereign to all account for high Treason against his Subjects, and to Detrone and Murder him for a Criminal, all they did the Royal Martyr by a Judiciary Sentence, who are Maintainers of Antimonarchical Schemes, and of such damnable Positions as are by the Laws of Church and State, condemn'd for Rebellion and high Treason, and who urge the Revolution in defence of such Principles, unless therefore those who impute Resistance to the Revolution, be the same with those new Preachers, and new Politicians above specify'd. The said Henry Sacheverell affirms nothing concerning them. The said Henry Sacheverell, upon the strictest search into his said Sermon Preached at St. Paul's, doth not find he hath given any the least colourable Pretence for the Accusation exhibited against him in this first Article; but barely by his Asserting the utter Illegality of Resistance to the Supream Power, upon any Pretence whatsoever, for which Assertion, he humbly conceives he hath the Authority of the Church of England, which in divers Passages of Her Homilies, too large and too numerous to be here specify'd, but by the said Henry Sacheverell, ready to be produc'd, hath taught and inculcated this Doctrine, as founded on the Word of God, particularly in the Second Part of the Sermon of Obedience, contain'd in the former Book of Homilies, see forth in the time of King Edward VI. where are these Words. *Here, good People, let us all mark diligently: It is not lawful for Inferiours and Subjects in any case, to resist and stand against the Superiour Powers; for St. Paul's Words be plain, that whosoever withstandeth, shall get to themselves Damnation; for whosoever withstandeth, withstandeth the ordinance of God.* —

Which said Book of Homilies is affirm'd in one of the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion, which concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, to contain a Godly and wholesome Doctrine, and is order'd to be read in Churches by the Ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the People. And the said Henry Sacheverell, in farther maintenance of the said Doctrine and Position contain'd in the Books of Homilies, and of the Authority of those Books, saith, That by an Act of Parliament made in the 18th Year of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, Intitl'd *An Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of Sound Religion: It is Enacted, That no Person should thereafter be admitted to any Benefice with Cure, except he should first have subscrib'd the said Articles in the presence of the Ordinary, and publicly read the same in the Parish Church of that Benefice, with Declaration of his unfeigned Assent to the same.* And that by an Act made in the 5th Year of Her present Majesty's Reign, Intitl'd, *an Act for securing the Church of England*

England, as by Law Establish'd, it was Enacted, That the said Act made in the said 13th Year of the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, should remain and be in full force for ever; and be incerted in expresse Terms in any Act which should be made, for ratifying the Union of the Two Kingdoms of *England* and *Scotland*; and therein declar'd to be an Essential and Fundamental Part thereof. And the said Act was accordingly incerted in expresse Terms, in an Act for the Union of the Two Kingdoms; and thereby ratify'd and declar'd to be an Essential and Fundamental part thereof. And the said *Henry Sacheverell* doth farther humbly insist, and is advis'd, that the aforesaid Assertion is agreeable to, and warranted by the Common Law of *England*, and divers Acts of Parliament now remaining in full force.

The said *Henry Sacheverell* doth with all humility aver the Illegality of Resistance on any pretence whatsoever, to be the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, and to have been the general Opinion of the most Orthodox and able Divines, from the Time of the Reformation to this Day. This Doctrine hath in the most Solemn manner been Taught in that University, whereof he hath been for more than Twenty Years a Member; this hath been often with publick Approbation of each House of Parliament Preach'd and Printed, and in Terms of greater force than any us'd by the said *Henry Sacheverell*, hath by the Right Reverend Fathers of our Church, Dead and Living, been avow'd and maintain'd.

And the said *Henry Sacheverell* was the rather induc'd to Preach against the Doctrines of Resistance of the Supream Power on the 5th Day of *November*, because on that Day the Church Commemorates our Deliverance from the Traiterous Attempts of Rebelious Papists; and because the Lawfulness of Resisting the Supream Powers was Originally a Popish Doctrine; for which Reasons, as he humbly conceives, the Rubrick of the Office appointed for that Day by her late Majesty Queen *Mary* (of Blessed Memory) Directs, 'That after the Creed, if there be no Sermon, shall be Read one of the six Homilies against Rebellion.

Whilst therefore the Church of *England*, as by Law Establish'd, is in a safe and flourishing Condition under Her Majesty's happy Administration, whilst Popish Tenets are by all good Protestants condemn'd and abhor'd, whilst the Laws of this Realm continue in their full Force and Vigour, the said *Henry Sacheverell* humbly hopes that a Dutiful Son of that Church, a Sincere Protestant, and Faithful Subject of Her Majesty, shall not suffer for Asserting the Doctrine of Non-Resistance of the Supream Powers. But if this Doctrine be declar'd Erroneous, and it shall please God that he should suffer for Asserting it, He trusts, that God will enable him to shew his Steady belief of this Doctrine, by a meek and patient Resignation to whatever shall befall him on that Account.

R E F L E C,

REFLECTIONS.

TIS hard to say, whether this Answer has more of silliness and hypocrisy, or falshood, since it appears plain by the *Doctors* two-penny Sermon, page 12. that he asserts the utter illegality of resisting a Prince, on any pretence whatever; but knowing that the late Revolution was directly against that slavish Position, and that 'twas not safe for him in expresse Terms to condemn the Resistance then made to King *James*, he attempts it by a side-wind, and falsely asserts, 'That those who defend Resistance against Princes, in any case whatever, by the said Revolution, are the greatest Enemies of that and his late Majesty; and the most Ungrateful for the Deliverance, who endeavour'd to cast such black and odious Colours upon both. How often must they be told, (says he) that the King himself solemnly disclaim'd the least imputation of Resistance in his Declaration. The *Doctor* to support this Assertion, quotes at the bottom of p. 13. a Passage of the Prince of *Orange's* additional Declaration, disclaiming all Design of Conquest; and this contrary to all Sense and Reason, he interprets to be a disclaiming of the least imputation of Resistance, as if Conquest and Resistance were convertible Terms; which is so mean and pitiful a subterfuge, as a Boy that has learn'd his *Grammar* wou'd be asham'd of; especially, since the Prince in his first Declaration, Art. 21. says expressly, 'That he thinks fit to go over to *England*, with a Force sufficient, by the Blessing of God, to defend him from the Violence of those evil Counsellors who had perswaded the late King *James* to all the Arbitrary Measures, complain'd of in the former part of the Declaration. One wou'd wonder, since the *Doctor* has quoted this very Passage in p. 9. of his Answer, that he shou'd not have confess'd his Error, in saying, That King *William* disclaim'd the least imputation of Resistance, when he had to do with such an August Assembly; as the *Commons* of *Great Britain*, whom he cou'd not think to be ignorant of that which is known to the meanest Trades-man, viz. that Defence from Violence, does necessarily imply Resistance. The *Doctor* knows also, that those evil Counsellors against whom King *William* declar'd he appear'd in Arms to defend himself, and the oppress'd Subjects of *Great Britain*, did act by Virtue of King *James's* Commission; and that to resist such, was as much disclaim'd by the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, preach'd up in the late Reigns, as resisting the Prince himself, and is call'd equally Traitorous by the 13 and 14 of *Charles II.* Cap. iv. Sect. 9. He must needs likewise know, that the imposing of that Declaration,

which had been so much wrested for the maintenance of Tyranny by our High Churchmen, in the late Reigns, was repeal'd by the 1 of *William and Mary*, chap. 8. and that the Act mention'd in the Preamble to the Articles of Impeachment, for preventing vexatious Suits against such as acted in order to the bringing in of their Majesties King *William* and Queen *Mary*, was made on purpose to obviate Prosecutions upon the Account of that Clause in the 13 and 14 of *Charles II.* or otherwise.

As this sufficiently justifies the Charge of the *Commons* in their first Article, That the *Doctor* did suggest and maintain in his Sermon preach'd at *St. Pauls*, that the necessary Means us'd to bring about the said happy Revolution were odious and unjustifiable; it likewise deprives the *Doctor* of the Honour of being a Confessor for his Darling Principles of *Passive Obedience* and *Non-Resistance*, since he so shamefully prevaricates and minces the Matter, for had he been true to those Principles, as they were preach'd up in the said Reigns, and as they are still maintain'd by the profess'd *Jacobites*, whose Interest he serves, he ought expressly to have condemn'd the Revolution, as inconsistent with that Doctrine, and publicly to have testify'd his Repentance for taking the Oaths to the present Government, in Opposition to it. Let the World judge then what Opinion we ought to entertain of such Men, who do thus prevaricate with God and the Government, take Oaths contrary to their own Principles, and utter such falsehoods in matter of fact from the Pulpit, from whence they ought to deliver nothing but the Oracles of God. The Princes Design of Resistance is still further evident, by the 25th Article of his Declaration; wherein he invites, 'All Persons whatever to assist him in the Execution of his Design against all such as should oppose him. And how this could be done without Resistance, let the *Doctor* explain if he can. The Princes Design of Resistance is likewise plain from the Association, sign'd by all the Lords and Gentlemen with him, before he left *Exeter*, wherein they declare, 'That as they had join'd with the Prince of *Orange* for the defence of the *Protestant* Religion, and for maintaining the ancient Government, Laws and Liberties of *England, Scotland* and *Ireland*; they did engage to Almighty God, to his Highness the Prince of *Orange*, and to one another, to stick firm to the Cause in the defence of it, and never to depart from it until our Religion, Laws, and Liberties were so far secur'd in a free Parliament, that we should no more be in Danger of falling under Popery and Slavery. And whereas they were engag'd in this Common Cause under the Protection of the Prince of *Orange*, by which, in case his Person might be expos'd to Danger, and to the cursed Attempts of *Papists*, and other bloody Men, they did therefore

solemn-

solemnly engage to God and one another, that if any such Attempt
 were made upon him, they would pursue not only those who made it, but
 all their Adherents, and all they should find in Arms against them, with
 the utmost Severity of a just Revenge, to their utter ruin and destruction.
 We refer it then to the Judgment of all Mankind, whether Dr. Sache-
 verel has any spark of Modesty left in him, who could so boldly as-
 sert from the Pulpit, that the Prince disclaim'd the least imputation
 of Resistance, when his own Declarations and this Association do so
 manifestly prove the contrary. We cannot suppose the Doctor, who
 has been for more than 20 Years a Member of the University of Ox-
 ford, as he says in his Defence, p. 11. could be ignorant of those things,
 or of the Blamishes that happen'd betwixt the Prince's Forces and
 those of the King at Wincanton, and Redding. But if it be alledg'd
 that he did not know them, it argues an intollerable carelessness for
 any Man to utter things from the Pulpit he did not understand, and
 much more that he shou'd not have read the History carefully before he
 had ventur'd on such a shuffling Answer to the Commons of Great
 Britain, who had impeach'd him according to the Duty they ow'd
 to God, to the Queen, and to their Country, whom they had the
 Honour to Represent.

His Prevarication is further observable, when he says, 'That King
 William declar'd his Expedition was intended for no other Design
 than to have a free and lawful Parliament assembled; since his Ma-
 jesty expressly declar'd in the 21st Article, 'That in order to this, all
 the late Charters, by which the Elections of Burgeses were limited
 contrary to the ancient Custom, shou'd be made void; that all Ma-
 gistrates unjustly turn'd out shou'd be restor'd, and that the Boroughs
 shou'd be return'd to their ancient Prescriptions and Charters; that
 the ancient Charter of the great City of London shou'd again be in
 Force; that the Writs for Members of Parliament shou'd be address'd
 to the proper Officers, according to Law and Custom; that none
 shou'd be suffer'd to Chuse, or be Chosen, but such as are qualify'd
 by Law; that the Members being thus lawfully Chosen, shou'd meet
 and sit in full Freedom; that the two Houses might concur in pre-
 paring such Laws, as upon full and free Debate they shou'd judge
 necessary both for confirming and executing the Law concerning the
 Test, and such others as were necessary for the security and main-
 tenance of the Protestant Religion, and likewise for making such as
 establish a good Agreement betwixt the Church of England and all
 Protestant Dissenters; as also, for the securing all such who wou'd
 live peaceably under the Government, as became good Subjects, from
 all Persecution upon the Account of Religion, even Papists them-
 selves not excepted; and for the doing of all other things which the

' two Houses of Parliament shou'd find necessary for the preservation
 ' of the Peace, Honour and Safety of the Nation, so that there might
 ' be no danger of its falling at any time hereafter under Arbitrary
 ' Government. To the Parliament he did also refer the En-
 ' quiry into the Birth of the Pretender, and of all things relating to
 ' it, and to the Right of Succession. 'Tis also evident by the 25 and
 ' 26 Articles of the Declaration, that the Prince declar'd, ' For a full
 ' Redress of all the Violences and Disorders, which had over-turn'd
 ' the whole Constitution of the *English* Government; that he wou'd
 ' also take care to have a Parliament call'd in *Scotland*, for Restoring
 ' the ancient Constitution of that Kingdom, and for bringing Matters
 ' of Religion to such a settlement, that the People might live easy
 ' and happy, and for putting an end to all the unjust Violences
 ' that had in a course of so many Years been committed there; and
 ' in the 14th Article, he declares against that absolute Power, which
 ' the King had pretended he was invest'd with in *Scotland*, and
 ' that all the Subjects there, were bound to obey him without Re-
 ' serve, upon which he had assum'd an Arbitrary Power over the
 ' Religion and Laws of that Kingdom. And in the last Article he
 ' declar'd, ' That he wou'd endeavour to bring the Kingdom of *Ire-*
 ' land to such a State, that the Settlement there might be Religi-
 ' ously observ'd, and the *Protestant* and *British* Interest secur'd.

Let the Reader be Judge then, whether the Doctor be not guilty of
 a Prevarication unbecoming any Man impeach'd by the *Commons* of
Great Britain, and much more one who has taken upon him the Sa-
 cred Function: But we are not to wonder at his misrepresenting the
 Princes Declarations, since they so expressly assert and prove his Design
 of Resistance, without which he cou'd never expect to bring about any
 one, and much less all those Purposes he declar'd for. He knew
 well enough that King *James* was possess'd of a numerous Army
 and Fleet, and that besides the *British* Soldiers he had modell'd to his
 Design, he had a great number of *Irish* Papists in his Army, upon
 whom first and last he repos'd his chief Confidence: Therefore the
 Prince arm'd himself against that Opposition, which he had so good
 Ground to expect.

By this 'tis also evident, that the legislative Power of Parliaments,
 their Right to Redress Grievances, of Setting the Succession, of
 Establishing a Toleration, and of plucking up the Roots of Arbitrary
 Government, and the Doctor's unconditional Obedience was as-
 serted; and since the Doctor has so positively condemn'd most of
 those things, in his two Sermons, 'tis evident that the *Commons* justly
 charg'd him to have aspers'd the Memory of his late Majesty, to have
 traduc'd

traduc'd and condemn'd the late happy Revolution, and to have cast black and odious Colours upon both.

The Doctors Sophism by which he wou'd avoid this Charge, is so very mean, that it cou'd not without Shame be offer'd to Smatterers in Logick, and therefore 'tis a plain proof of his incurable Obstinacy in his seditious and slavish Principles, to offer it to the Honourable House of Commons, since 'tis so notoriously contrary to the tendency, and the very Words of his Sermons, where he expressly condemns all Resistance, and dethronement of Princes on any pretence whatever; for 'tis known to the whole Nation, that Resistance was not only intended, but actually made by the late Revolution, and dethronement followed upon it, by reason of King *James's* Obstinacy in adhering to those arbitrary Measures, for redress of which, the Revolution was undertaken. So that the Doctors miserable subterfuge in alledging that he affirms nothing of those who impute Resistance to the Revolution, unless they be the same with those new Preachers, and new Politicians he specifies in the Twelfth Page of his Sermon, can stand him in no stead, for tho' he draws up a complex charge against Principles disown'd by those who were, and still are for the Revolution, yet since he absolutely condemns in that same Charge all Resistance and Dethronement on any pretence whatever, both which he knows they own and justify, with relation to the late King *James*. He has cast the most black and odious Colours upon them he can, and in order to do so, has treated them as the Papists commonly do such Protestants as they condemn to the Flames; who, that they may fall without Compassion, do with the Truths they really hold, charge them with abominable Errors, which they abhor and condemn. And thus he falsely charges the Revolution Party, with maintaining, that the People have a Power to cancel their Allegiance at pleasure, and call their Sovereign to an Account for High Treason against his Supreme Subjects, &c. and that we might be sure he means the present Revolution Party, he tells us in his Sermon, Page 12, that they presume to make Court to their Prince by such Antimonarchical Schemes, whereas the contrary is very well known, nor can the Doctor produce one Revolution Author to justify his Charge. They never asserted that the People have a Right to cancel their Allegiance, or to call Princes to an Account for Treason against Supreme Subjects at pleasure; but all Men who have read our Histories and Laws, know that Kings have been called to an Account, and dethron'd oftener than once by Parliaments, who have a joint Power in the Legislature, for invading our fundamental Liberties, and assuming to themselves an Arbitrary Power, to suspend and make void Laws without their Consent. This was the Case of King *John*, *Edward II.* and *Richard II.* so that the dethronement of King *James* was not without

without good and warrantable Presidents. Had the Doctor been as well vers'd in our ancient Constitution and Law Books, as he is in the modern Doctrines of Tyranny and Slavery, and in the Arts of Railing and Malice, which necessarily attend them, he would have found that our Ancestors treated Parliaments with more Respect than he and the rest of the *Laudean* Faction think themselves oblig'd to do. Thus *Bracton* Lib. 2. Cap. 16. and *Fleta* Lib. 1. Cap. 16. have these memorable Words, In governing the People, the King has above him the Law, by which he is constituted King, and his Parliament, viz. the Earls and the Barons, the Earls in Latin being call'd *Comites*, i. e. Companions and Fellows; now he that has a Fellow has a Master, wherefore if a King become lawless, they must give him Law and curb him, by which it appears, that our Kings when they formerly subverted the Constitution, were call'd to an Account by the Laws which made them Kings, and by their Partners in the Legislature, the Lords and Commons who are the best Judges, when the Laws, which they themselves had a share in making, are invaded and subverted. But whether it be consistent with the Rules of good breeding, or with the deference that all the People of Great Britain owe to their Legislators, to taunt them with the reproachful Name of Sovereign Subjects, as the Doctor does p. 12. of his Sermon, when they actually exercise that part of the Sovereign Power which our Constitution has lodg'd in them, let him and his Advocate see to it. King *Henry VIII.* who understood and practis'd Prerogative, as much as any Prince ever we had, was so far from looking upon the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament as mere Subjects, that he own'd them to be part of the Supreme Body *politico*; and that this was not his Opinion alone, but that of all his Judges: For he said in Parliament in the 34th Year of his Reign, we are inform'd by our Judges, that we at no time stand so high in our Estate Royal, as in time of Parliament, wherein we as Head, and you as Members, are conjoin'd and knit together in one Body *Politic*, as we are inform'd by *Crompton's Jurisdiction*, Folio 10.

For the Doctors Charge upon the Revolution Party, that they look upon the People to be the Foundation and Original of Power, he ought to have explain'd the Terms, or at least to have given us the Sense of 'em, before he had made it a cause of Reproach. Every one knows that Metaphors must not be too closely pursu'd, he is very ill vers'd in Natural Philosophy, who will offer to assert, that a Fountain is the Original of Water, since every body knows that tis only an Instrument of Conveyance. In like manner the Revolution Party do own, and always assert, that God is the Original of Power, and that Government is of his appointment; but they cou'd never yet see, it prov'd that God himself has nominated any Kings or other Governors, since the Jewish Government

very much obliged to the Doctor and
 his Party, if they could tell them from what other Fountain than that
 of the People, the Right to the Exercise of Government has been origi-
 nally conveyed to any of the reigning Families now in Europe. But
 what every man has said for other Countries, we are as certain of the
 Fact in Great Britain, as History, Law, and Experience can make us.
 For even William the Conqueror, after he had defeated Harold and his
 Party, thought fit to waive his Title of Conqueror, and judge it better
 to hold the Crown of England by the more solid Tenure of swearing to
 govern the Subjects according to the Laws of S. Edward, one of which
 is, as we find in Lambard's Saxon Laws, that if he did not govern accord-
 ing to the Law for which he was constituted, he should not so much as retain
 the Name of a King, but lose it; which every one must own to have
 been a very strong Original Contract, and that this was the Constitu-
 tion in the time of our Saxon Ancestors, appears from History, and
 by the *Mirror*, Chap. 1. Sect. 2. which tells us this was a Clause of the
 Coronation Oath, that the King should be obedient to suffer the Law, as
 much as others of his People. Then as to the Fountain of Power, the
 Lord Chancellor *Forbes* thought it so far from being Treason to ascribe
 it to the People, that he plainly tells the P. of Wales, to whom he de-
 dicated his Book, *De laudibus legum Angliæ*, that the King is rais'd to
 that Dignity to defend the Laws, his Subjects, their Bodies, and Estates,
 and that to this end he is entrusted with a Power deriv'd from the People,
 so that he is not lawful for him to Lord it over his Subjects by any other Power.
 And no Man I suppose will doubt that the Lord Chief Justice *Bracton*,
 and the Lord Chancellor *Forbes*, understood the Constitution of Eng-
 land as well as Doctor *Sacheverell*, or any of his high flying Party.
 Tho' the Doctor think it an Absurdity to say that a Prince may be ca-
 pable of Treason against his Subjects, or that Treason can be committed
 against any other than a King or Queen; Our ancient Lawyers were
 of another Opinion. Thus in *Hengham magna* Cap. 2. Treason is branch'd
 out thus, *De nece, vel seditione personæ domini Regis, vel Regni, vel Ex-*
ercitus. And with him agree *Bracton*, *Fleta*, and *Britton*, so that ac-
 cording to them, Treason might be committed against the Army and
 Kingdom, as well as against the Person of the King and Queen: In
Hengham parva, Cap. 3. 'tis also called Treason to raise War against
 the Kingdom, as well as against the King; so that our Ancestors wou'd
 have made no scruple to have said the late King *James* was guilty of
 Treason, in raising an Army to invade our fundamental Constitution,
 and to support him in usurping the sole Legislative Power. This is yet
 more plain from the Ancient Allegiance sworn by our Ancestors, as ap-
 pears from *L. 1. Guilielm. Spicileg.* 59. by which they were sworn to defend
 the Kingdom, as well as the King. And *Matthew Paris* tells us, Anno
 1100 and 1213; that the Order of Knighthood, the chief strength of
 the

(16)

the Kingdom in those Days, was determin'd upon the Service of the King, and the Defence of the Kingdom; or as 'twas explain'd by the Statute of *Mortmain* in the 7th of *Edward I.* for the Service of the King in defence of the Kingdom; by which it appears, that Allegiance to the Kingdom as well as to the King, was enacted by Authority of King and Parliament. Besides, 'tis evident from the Nature of the thing, for if the Kingdom be the Kings Body *politico*, as *Henry VIII.* own'd, and which no Man of Sense can deny, it must be as actually Treason in any Man to endeavour to subvert the Constitution of the Kingdom, as to dethrone the King; and our Laws wou'd judge it to be as much Treason to cut off a Kings Arm or Leg, as to cut off his Head: To this we shall add, that the great Sir *H. Spelman* in his Glossary, says, that the Oath of Allegiance, *Ligantia*, is reciprocal betwixt the King and the Subject, all which makes it plain, that a King may be capable of Treason against the Kingdom, for to act contrary to Allegiance is to commit Treason.

Then as to the Hereditary Right of Succession, this appears plain to be owing to Act of Parliament, for every one who knows our History, must own that for a considerable time after *William* the Conqueror, there was no such thing as a lineal Hereditary Descent, which is so plain, that 'tis needless to insist upon proving it. However, the present Revolution Party are so far from being Enemies to a legal Hereditary Right of Succession, that we see they made the Title Hereditary again at the time of the Revolution, and have made it so since in the Protestant Line, but with such Limitations as may make the Hereditary Right consistent with the welfare of the People, which is the Supreme Law and end of Government. This was so far from being reckon'd a Republican Principle in Queen *Elizabeth's* time, that by the 13th of her Reign, *Cap. 1.* 'twas made Treason 'to affirm that the Laws and Statutes do not bind the right of the Crown, and the Descent, Limitation, Inheritance, or Government thereof, by which we may perceive, that 'tis the Dr. and not the Revolution-Men, who have gone off from the Principles of the Church of *England* in this Matter, for if the Queen and Parliament could bind the Right, Descent, Limitation, Inheritance, and Government of the Crown in Queen *Elizabeth's* time, there's no reason to be assign'd why Queen *Anne* and her Parliament should not have the same Power, for 'tis a Right Inherent and Inseparable from all Nations, to have the same Power of making Laws for their own Preservation and better Government, that their Ancestors had.

But

The Doctor is so unhappy as to contradict himself, p. 10. where he pretends to defend the utter Illegality of resisting the Supreme Power, on any Pretence whatsoever, by the Authority of the Church of *England*, for this is positively to condemn the Revolution, which he deny'd he did, p. 9. but that is common to Falshood, which can never be of a piece; and thus he also condemns those who impute Resistance to the Revolution, of whom, if we can believe him, he had before affirm'd nothing. But now let's come to his Authority, which is the Book of Homilies of the Church of *England*, affirm'd in one of the 39 Articles of Religion to contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and is order'd to be read in Churches by the Ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the People, and these Homilies do expressly say, *That 'tis not lawful for Inferiours and Subjects in any Case to resist and stand against the Superior Powers.* No doubt the Faction thinks this unanswerable, but the Objection will speedily vanish, when we consider that those Homilies had a View to the Rebellions rais'd by Papists, who were meer private Persons, against King *Edward VI.* and Queen *Elizabeth*, and were so far from having Law on their side, that it was against them; but what says this to the present Case? The Doctor should have produc'd an Instance from the Homilies to prove that 'tis unlawful for the Lords and Commons of such Kingdoms as ours, where they have a joint Share with their Princes in the Legislature, to resist or dethrone such Princes as attempt the Subversion of the Constitution, and take upon themselves the whole Legislative Power, tho' they have no Right to make, alter, or suspend Laws, but in Conjunction with their Parliaments; but this was so far from being the meaning of those who compos'd the Homilies, that we have unanswerable Arguments to prove the contrary; the first is, That in the Homilies against Rebellion, (which is resisting or withstanding common Authority, as the Homily of Obedience defines it) they do not speak one Word of submitting to Lawless Violence, but on the contrary propose *David* for an Example of Loyalty, and give him the Character of a Person the farthest off from all manner of Rebellion, tho' there never was a greater Instance of Self-Defence than he, (who was a Man according to God's own Heart) made against King *Saul* when he turn'd Tyrant. The second is, that Bishop *Jewel*, one of those who wrote the Homilies, and by Consequence best understood their meaning, in *the Defence of his Apology for the Church of England*, has these Words, 'Neither do any of all these, *Luther*, *Melancton*, &c. teach the People to rebel against their Prince, but only to defend themselves, by all lawful Means, against Oppression, as did *David* against King *Saul*; so do the Nobles in *France* at this Day, they seek not to kill, but to save their own Lives, as they have openly protested by publick Writing to the World. As for us, we are Strangers to their Case, they themselves are best acquainted with the Laws and Constitution of

C

their

their Country, and therefore are best able to yield an Account of the Grounds and Reasons of their Doings; by this 'tis plain that Bishop Jewel, who wrote the Homilies, never intended they should condemn all Resistance on any Pretence whatsoever.

But 'tis needless to insist on the Opinions of particular Men who liv'd when the Homilies were made, and perfectly understood the meaning of 'em, since we have the Sense of the whole Church of *England*, and all the Compilers of the Homilies, in direct Opposition to the Doctor's Assertion, of which he cannot be ignorant, since it has been so often insisted upon; this is a high Aggravation of his Falshood and Malice, and makes his prevaricating with the Lords and Commons inexcusable; the Truth of this is evident, as Mr. *Johnson* well observ'd in his Answer to *Constantius* the Apostate, since the whole Clergy of *England* did in several Convocations in *Queen Elizabeth's* Time not only maintain in Words the Justice of the *French*, *Scotch*, and *Dutch* Defences, which the Protestants of those Countries made for the Safety of their Lives, Liberties, and Religion, but open'd their Purses to help them against their respective Princes, and charg'd themselves deeply with Taxes in Consideration of the Queen's great Charge and Expence in assisting them, as appears by the Preambles of the Clergy's Subsidy Acts in that Reign, and her Parliaments did the like; from whence that Reverend and Learned Author justly argues, That if the *French*, *Dutch* and *Scotch* Protestants were Rebels in defending themselves against the illegal and destructive Violence of their Princes, then the Bishops and Clergy of *England*, (and he might have added the Queen and Laity, since She and the Parliament join'd with them) did by assisting them involve themselves in the same guilt, for if they had thought it utterly Unlawful to assist Subjects against Tyrannical Princes, or that *St. Paul* had threaten'd it with Damnation, they must have been willing to purchase it at a very dear Rate, since the Clergy apply'd a whole Years Revenue of all the Benefices of *England*, to resist the Ordinance of God. By this it appears, that the new modish Doctrin of submitting to all Sorts of lawless Oppression is Madness and Innovation, and wholly unknown to the Compilers of our Homilies, and that 'tis Dr. *Sacheverell*, and his Faction, and not the Revolution Party, who are Apostates from the primitive Sense of the first Protestant Church of *England*.

The Doctor insists p. 11. That he is advis'd that his Assertion of the utter Illegality of resisting Princes on any Pretence whatsoever, is agreeable to and warranted by the Common Law of *England*, and divers Acts of Parliament now remaining in full force.

Our Parliament may perhaps think it worth while to enquire who it was that gave him this Advice, for if our Common Law be no other than pure and try'd Reason, as *Plouden* says in his Commentaries, *Case of Mines*, fol. 316. the Doctor's Assertion is so far from being agreeable

able to the Common Law, that 'tis quite contrary to it, for pure and try'd Reason will never allow an uncontrollable Power in a Prince to Invade the Lives and Fortunes of his Subjects at Pleasure, or to wish they had all but one Neck, that he might Behead them all at once, or to set their Capital Cities on Fire, and make it the Subject of his Spoil and Diversion, as was practis'd by Nero, for such a Power is inconsistent with the end of Government, which was appointed by God that we might live peaceable and Godly Lives under it as we are inform'd by Revelation as well as Reason. Or if our Common Law be the absolute perfection of Reason as Sir Edward Coke tells us *Instit.* part 1. pag. 179. Or those which the Norman Conqueror did at his Coronation Swear to observe, as that same great Lawyer tells us in the Preface to his 8th Book of Reports, the Doctor's Assertion is expressly Condemn'd by it, for it appears by the 17th Law of S. Edward, confirm'd and sworn to by William the Conqueror, *that if a King do not defend his People for which he was appointed, he looses the Name and Title of a King*, as we have it in Lambard's *Saxon Laws*, p. 142. Answerable to this the Lord Chief Justice Bracton who flourish'd about 1260. says in his Book of the Laws of England; ' That the King has no Power but from the Law, and therefore ought to exercise it, as becomes the Minister of God upon Earth, because that Power is the Power of God alone, but the Power of doing Wrong is the Power of the Devil and not of God, and the King is his Minister, whose Work he does; While he does Justice he is the Vicar of the Eternal King, but if he turn from it and act unjustly, he is the Minister of the Devil. He adds, that the King who in Execution of Justice is greater than every one, *in receiving Justice is equal to the common People*. And Book III. Chap. 9. he says, that if the King be without a Bridle, that is without Law, that the English Barons, &c. ought to impose a Bridle on him.

But we have yet a greater Authority, which is that of King James I. in his Speech to his Parliament, March 21. 1609. wherein he says, ' The King is bound by a double Oath to preserve the Laws, tacitly as being King, and expressly by his Coronation Oath, so is every just King bound to observe the Paction made with his People, by his Laws, framing the Government thereunto, and a King leaves to be King, and degenerates into a Tyrant, as soon as he leaves off to govern by Law, in which Case the King's Conscience may speak to him as the poor Woman to Philip of Macedon, *Either govern according to Law, or cease to be King*. Now I hope the Doctor will allow that it is lawful to resist one who is no King.

By all this we may see that our Convention acted according to the Common Law of England, when they Dethron'd the late King James, who instead of defending his People according to his Oath, rais'd Armies and usurp'd a sole Legislative Power to Subvert the Consti-

rution of Church and State. Let the World Judge then, whether the Doctor and his Advisers have not wickedly misrepresented the Common Law of *England*.

Their Arrogance in asserting that the abovemention'd Assertion is warranted by divers Acts of Parliament now remaining in full Force, is yet more intolerable, but 'tis scarce to be suppos'd that any Gentleman of the long Robe wou'd so far prostitute his Character as to give him such Advice. Had the Doctor been at a quarter of the Pains to turn over our Statute Books that he has been at to Study the Doctrine of Slavery, he cou'd never have had the Confidence to offer such a Defence to the Parliament of *Great Britain*. He might without consulting any Body have been set right in this matter, had he look'd upon the 36th Act of the 1st of *William and Mary*, declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, for invading of which King *James* was Dethron'd, and the 1st of *William and Mary* Chap. 8. Sect. 11. which makes void the Passive Obedience Clause in the 2 Acts of the 13th and 14th of *Charles II.* formerly mention'd, and his Doubts might have been fully clear'd, had he look'd upon the 9th Sect. of the 36th Act of the 1st of *William and Mary*, which Absolves us from our Allegiance to any King or Queen that shall profess the Popish Religion, or Marry a Papist. Now how this is to be done without resisting such Princes, who contrary to this Act shall keep Possession of the Throne, the Doctor would do well to inform us. But since 'tis impossible the Doctor could be Ignorant of this, we have reason to believe that he and his Advisers do not look upon any Acts made since the Revolution to be in Force, for 'tis utterly impossible that the above-mention'd Clause of the 13th and 14th of *Charles II.* and this Act of *William and Mary* can both be in Force at the same time. How he can reconcile this Assertion with the Oath of Allegiance he has taken to the Queen, who deriv'd her Title to the Crown from the Declaration of Rights, and accepted it upon those Terms, let him and his University Casuists consider.

This brings us to another part of his Defence, p. 11. viz. ' That the illegality of Resistance, &c. has been the general Opinion of the most Orthodox and able Divines from the time of the Reformation to this Day. This is so false, that none but the *Laudean* Faction could ever have the Confidence to assert it, tho' at other Times when they thought it would serve a Turn to reproach Foreign Churches, they have expressly said the contrary; no Body can be Ignorant of this, who has look'd into *Heylin's* Works, where he upbraids the Reformers in all other Parts but in *England*, with carrying on the Reformation by Rebellion. This is plain from p. 132, of his *Cosmography*, Publish'd in 1703. and Dr. *Sacheverell* cou'd not be Ignorant of this, since he Copies *Heylin's* very Words in the 19 p. of his Sermon, viz. *That the Genevan Discipline was begot in Rebellion, Born in Sedition, and Nurs'd up in Faction*, which is a manifest Proof of the Doctor's Pre-

Prevarication. Nor can he be ignorant of *Heylin's* taking notice of the League of *Smalcald*, by which the Protestants of *Germany* enter'd into a Confederacy for defense of their Religion and Liberty against the Emperor, and if he had cast his Eye upon *Sleidan's* Commentaries, he might have found that *Luther*, who was at first as much for Passive Obedience as he, recanted his Opinion, when he was inform'd that the Constitution of the Empire allowed the Subjects to defend themselves against the Emperors Tyranny, an Example which deserves the Doctors Consideration, since that great Reformer submitted himself in Controversies of State to the Decision of the States, and did not make the narrow Opinions of other Divines his Rule; but 'tis needless to insist on this Subject, since every one knows that the Reform'd Churches in *France*, *Switzerland*, the *Netherlands*, and *Scotland*, were all for the Lawfulness of resisting Tyrants, and practis'd accordingly, and we have heard already that the Church of *England* did not only approve but assist them in so doing. Besides the *Germans* and *French* were particularly assisted in resisting their Princes by *King James* and *King Charles I.* so that even the Royal Martyr cannot escape the Condemnation of the Doctor and his Brethren.

His next Defence is, ' That this Doctrin hath in the most solemn manner been taught in that University whereof he hath been for more than 20 Years a Member, and that it hath been often with publick Approbation of each House of Parliament Preach'd and Printed, and in Terms of greater Force than any us'd by him, been avow'd and maintain'd by the Right Reverend Fathers of our Church Dead and Living.

One would think that Passive Obedience rightly understood, might have taught the Doctor more Modesty than to set up the Opinion of the University of *Oxford*, or of particular Divines, against the Determination of the whole Church and State of *England* before-mention'd. This is such a way of arguing, as very ill becomes any Subject, but especially one in his Circumstances to make use of against the Legislative Power of *Great Britain*. We are come to a fine pass indeed, when the Decisions of an University, Corrupted by Slavish Principles, and manag'd by Arbitrary Princes, shall be set up against Acts of Kings, Queens, Parliaments and Convocations; especially when the contrary Doctrins have been maintain'd by all the Protestant Churches and Universities in *Europe*. This is not very much for the Honour of the University of *Oxford*, and may be of as little Advantage to the Champions of that Slavish Doctrin, if Her Majesty and the Parliament, who have sufficient Provocation to do it, should turn out such Members of that, or the other University, as are tainted with Principles inconsistent with the *British* Constitution, and cast such odious Reflections upon all other Protestant Universities, which have Bred as Good, and as great Men as any of our Universities could ever pretend to.

For

For the other part of his Defence, that his Doctrin of Non-resistance has been often approv'd by each House of Parliament, 'tis Insolent to the highest Degree to Argue thus in the Face of our present Legislature, who approve the Acts which have set that Doctrin aside, and the Revolution which was carried on by the contrary Principle. Besides, the Doctor will scarce be able to make it good that any Parliament of *England* did ever approve that Doctrin as he has laid it down in his Sermons and Defence. The only Parliament that can be alledg'd to have favour'd this Doctrin, was that of *Charles II.* which Enacted the Clause above-mention'd; but how often must the Doctor and his Party be told that it appear'd by their own Practice that they never understood it in his Sense, for every one knows they Impeach'd and Imprison'd *K. Charles's* Ministers for advising him to Arbitrary Measures. They Prosecuted the Popish Plot to the utmost, tho' they knew the Court was in it, which was far from the Practice of Passive Obedience, which teaches that Princes, or those who Act by their Commission, are not in any Case to be Resisted; and every one must own that the Parliament was the best Expositors of their own Law. To this we may add, that the Court themselves did very well know that the Parliament who Enacted that Clause, never understood it in their Sense, so that at last they grew weary of that Parliament, and Dissolv'd it after 18 Years continuance, because of their Prosecution of the Popish Plot, and Voting that the Army should be Disbanded, &c. We see then what Stress is to be laid on the Doctor's Assertion, that this Doctrin hath been often approv'd by each House of Parliament, when the only Parliament that seem'd to favour it was Dissolv'd by the Court, and loaded with Reproaches as if they had been Enemies to the King and Government. 'Tis also to be observ'd, that the King among other Things charg'd them with ' Having invaded the Prerogative of the Crown in making War and Peace in a more dangerous manner than had been done in any Age, when the Sword was not drawn, because they address'd him to enter into a League Offensive and Defensive against the *French* King, and for the Preservation of the *Spanish Netherlands*, for which they were separated without either Prorogation or legal Adjournment, and the last time he Prorogu'd them before their Dissolution, he told them he had not been well used by them. This is more than sufficient to prove that that Parliament never understood the Passive Obedience Clause which they Enacted, in the Sense of the Doctor and his Party, and that they meant no more by it than to secure the King against all manner of Violence, while he Govern'd according to Law. We all know that the next Parliament was so far from Passive Obedience, that the Court charg'd many of the Members with a Design to have rais'd War against the King, because they were for Prosecuting the Popish Plot, for endeavouring to exclude the Duke of *York* from the Crown,

and

and proposing an Association for the Defence of his Majesties Person and Government, for which the Court design'd to have raken the Earl of *Shaftsbury's* Life, and those of other Patriots as Plotters, and Dissolv'd the Parliament with a reproachful Declaration, which the King order'd to be Read in all the Churches of *England*.

We must own indeed that whatever the Parliament intended, the Design of the Court by that Clause was to Enslave the Nation, to overturn all our Laws, and set up Arbitrary Power, according to the private Engagements King *Charles II.* had enter'd into with the *French* King, to secure himself an absolute Authority over his Parliament, and to Establish Popery in *Great Britain* and *Ireland*. So that 'tis not much for the Honour of the Doctor and his Faction to plead so furiously for the reviving of this Doctrin, at a time when Attempts have been made, and are still carried on to bring us again under a Popish Prince, and a *French* Government.

But admitting the Doctors Allegation to be true, that the first Parliament of *K. Charles II.* had approv'd this Doctrin, it can make nothing for his Defence to revive it now, since 'tis inconsistent with our present Constitution, and the Acts of Parliament formerly mention'd. Besides, 'twas Condemn'd by many of our former Parliaments from Age to Age, and particularly that of King *John*, when the Parliament reserv'd a Power to themselves to compel him by all means possible to keep the Great Charter, as they did also in the time of his Son King *Henry*, so that 'tis certain that this Doctrin has been Condemn'd by many Parliaments, but it passes the Doctor's Power to prove that 'twas ever Ratify'd by one in his Sense.

The Doctor at the Bottom of p. 11. says, ' He was the rather induc'd to Preach against the Doctrin of Resisting supreme Powers on the 5th of *November*, because on that Day we Commemorate our Deliverance from the treacherous Attempts of the *Papists*, and because the Lawfulness of Resisting the Supreme Powers was originally a Popish Doctrin.

But why then did the Doctor pervert the design of the Day, say so little of the *Papists*, and discharge all the Batteries of his Fury against the Dissenters and Moderate Church-Men. Malice it self cannot charge them with any design against the present Constitution, which is the only security they have under God for their Religion, Lives, and Estates; but all the World knows, that the Doctor's High Church, have in Conjunction with the *Papists* and the *French* King, attempted Invasions, Insurrections, and Assassinations, which several of 'em confess'd at the Gallows, when they were brought thither according to their Demerits. The Doctor himself by the Dedication of his *Derby* Sermon, where he threatens us with Lives and Fortunes in readiness to defend his Cause, has given too just reason for the Commons to charge him with Endeavours to incite the Subjects

to Sedition and Rebellion, in which the insolent Behaviour of the Faction since his Impeachment shews that they are not mistaken, so that we have reason to think, that his groundless Charge against the Low Church and Dissenters, as if they were running down the Church and Constitution, was a Clamour rais'd by him and his Party, on purpose to alarm the Nation with Apprehensions of a false Plot on purpose to cover a true one, for no body of common Sense can think the maintaining the Principles of the Revolution by the Moderate Church and Dissenters, can infer any Danger to the Government, which is founded upon them, but must rather contribute to its support, so that this could afford him no Handle to treat them as he does contrary to the design of the Day, or to charge either of 'em to be begot in Rebellion, born in Sedition, and nurs'd up in Faction, a Charge which every way fits the *Papists*; but we are not to wonder that he pass'd over them so slightly, since the Patriarch of his Party, Archbishop Laud, struck those Words out of the Office of the Day, by which the Church formerly pray'd, *to be deliver'd from the Papists; whose Religion was Rebellion*; And was Angry with good Archbishop *Usher*, for inserting in the *Irish* Articles, that the Pope was the Man of Sin, as *Heylin* tells us in his Life.

The Doctor with his usual Confidence and Ignorance, says, that the lawfulness of resisting Supreme Powers was originally a Popish Doctrine. Had he said, that the lawfulness of Rebelling against King and Parliaments was originally a Popish Doctrine, we might have believ'd him, but to say that the lawfulness of resisting Tyrants was originally so, is as great a blunder, and discovers his Ignorance of the Scripture as much as the Passage in the 20 Page of his Sermon, that the Prophet *Elisha's* Servant did not see his Master's Danger till his Eyes were open'd by Miracle, and he found himself in the midst of Charets and Horses of Fire, whereas 'tis plain from the Text, that the Prophet's Servant was sufficiently alarmed at his Master's Danger by an Army of *Syrians*, and could not be rid of his Fear till his Eyes were open'd by Miracle to see the Charets and Horses of Fire, which Heaven had sent to defend him. Had the Doctor been as much conversant with the Bible as he is with the malicious Invectives of the *Laudean* Faction, he would have found that the Resisting and Dethroning of *Rehoboam* for refusing to redress the Grievances of the People was approv'd by God himself, *1 Kings* 12. He might also have found that *David* with an armed Force resisted the Tyranny of *Saul*, and design'd to have joyn'd the *Philistins* in making War upon him tho' he was both his Prince and his Father in Law. I hope the Doctor will not say that God, and the Man according to his own Heart learn'd this Doctrine from the *Papists*. But we can tell him further, that the Old Barons of *England* when the Pope taught the contrary Doctrine, and sent them a threatening Letter, if they would
not

not give over making War upon King *John* for breaking the great Charter ; despis'd the Thunder of the Vatican as much as we do the Anathemas of the Superiour Pastors, and would not desist, as *Matthew Paris* tells us, p. 186. Besides this Doctrine of Resistance was so far from being peculiar to the Pope and his Vassals, that 'twas own'd by all the Ambassadors of the Western Church at the Council of Basil, and particularly by those of *England*, our Barons having deposed *Richard II.* about 16 Years before that Council met : The Doctor may find this, if he pleases in *Aeneas Sylvius's* First Book of the Proceedings of that Council, where it appears that they were so far from deriving that Doctrine from the Pope, that they deriv'd it from the Legal Constitution of Kingdoms, and urg'd it as an Argument for the Power of a General Council to depose the Pope himself, by which it is plain, that the Church learn'd this Doctrine from the State, and not the State from the Church.

We cannot but take notice that the Doctor in the 12 p. of his Answer, either contradicts himself in what he had formerly asserted of the Church's Danger, or banters the Parliament when he says ; ' Whilst therefore the Church of *England* as by Law establish'd is in ' a safe and flourishing Condition under Her Majesty's happy Admi- ' nistration, &c. But since 'tis more probable he designs the latter, 'tis a very indifferent Proof of his Submission to the Supreme Powers.

In the latter end of that Paragraph he says, if this Doctrine of ' Non-resistance be declar'd Erroneous, and it shall please God that ' he suffer for asserting it, he trusts that God will enable him to shew ' his steady Belief of this Doctrine, by a meek and patient Resigna- ' tion to whatever shall befall him on that Account

Had the Doctor consulted the above-mention'd Proceedings of the Convocations in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time, and our Statute-Books since the Revolution, he might have found that this Doctrine stands condemn'd both by Church and State already ; and had he consider'd the Preamble of the Articles exhibited against him by the Commons, he could not but see that they approve of that Condemnation ; and 'tis not improbable but he will find the Lords do the same to his Cost.

As to his steady Belief of this Doctrine, tho' it should be further condemn'd, one would be tempted to think that the Doctor understands nothing by Belief but winking hard against all Arguments, as the *Papists* do in the Case of Transubstantiation. Then for the Meekness and Patience which he trusts God will endue him with if he suffer, he ought to have consider'd whether there be any Promise of those Qualifications to such who suffer as Evil-doers, except they repent of their Crimes, whereas he is obstinately resolv'd to persist in his ; and we may likewise tell him that he must lay aside his Fire and Brimstone, of which he was so liberal at *Derby* and at *St. Pauls*, before he can have

any room for those adorning Graces with which he and his Faction have declar'd open War, as appears by their daily Conduct.

ARTICLE II.

He, the said Henry Sacheverell, in his said Sermon preach'd at St. Paul's, doth suggest and maintain, That the aforesaid Toleration, granted by Law, is unreasonable, and the Allowance of it unwarrantable; and asserts, That he is a false Brother with relation to God's Religion, or the Church, who defends Toleration and Liberty of Conscience. That Queen Elizabeth was deluded by Archbishop Grindall, whom he scurrilously calls a False Son of the Church, and a perfidious Prelate, to the Toleration of the Genevian Discipline; and that it is the Duty of superior Pastors to thunder out their Ecclesiastical Anathema's against Persons entitl'd to the Benefit of the said Toleration, and insolently dares or defies any Power on Earth to reverse such Sentences.

Answer to the second Article.

To that part of the second Article which charges, That he the said Henry Sacheverell doth suggest and maintain, That the Toleration granted by Law is unreasonable, and the Allowance of it unwarrantable, The said Henry Sacheverell saith, — That upon the most diligent Enquiry he has not been able to inform himself that a Toleration hath been granted by Law, but admits that an Act did pass in the first Year of King William and Queen Mary, entitl'd, 'An Act for exempting their Majesties Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the Penalties of certain Laws. Which Exemption the said Henry Sacheverell doth not any where maintain, or suggest to be unreasonable, or that the Allowance of it is unwarrantable, but hop'd that he had prevented any such Misapprehension, by declaring his sincere Meaning in these Words contain'd in his Sermon preach'd at St. Paul's; (pag. 20. line 8.) "I would not be understood as if I intended
" to cast the least invidious Reflection upon that Indulgence which the
" Government hath condescended to give them, which I am sure all
" those who wish well to our Church are ready to grant to Consciences
" truly scrupulous, let them enjoy it in the full Limits the Law has
" prescrib'd.

If there be any other Expressions concerning Toleration which may seem to carry a dubious Sense in any other part of his Sermon, he hopes they will not be apply'd to the Exemption granted by Law, but will be interpreted agreeably to his avow'd Approbation of that Law.

And as to such part of the said second Article as charges that the said Henry Sacheverell asserts, (p. 8. l. 37.) 'That he is a false Brother with relation to God, Religion, or the Church, who defends Toleration

ration and Liberty of Conscience. He the said *Henry Sacheverell* saith, That he having so plainly declar'd himself in favour of the Exemption granted by Law, when he blames those who upon all Occasions defend Toleration and Liberty of Conscience, cannot be thought to reflect on the Defenders of that Legal Exemption or Indulgence which he himself approves and defends; he doth indeed suggest it to be one part of the Character of a false Brother, upon all Occasions to defend Toleration and Liberty of Conscience, and to excuse the Separation, lay the Fault upon true Sons of the Church for carrying Matters too high: Which Universal Defence of Toleration, and Excuse of Separation, attended with the laying the Fault of such Separation upon the true Sons of the Church, are by him jointly mention'd in one and the same Sentence, and in one and the same Branch of the Character. So that his Reflection doth not extend to all who defend Toleration and Liberty of Conscience, much less to those who defend the Exemption granted by Law to Protestant Dissenters, but only to such, who at the same time they defend Universal Toleration and Liberty of Conscience, do also excuse the Separation, and lay the Fault thereof upon the true Sons of the Church, for carrying Matters too high. And these he did then, and still doth, with all Humility, conceive to be justly blamable, and if Members of this Church, to be false Brethren.

And as to that part of the second Article, whereby the said *Henry Sacheverell* is charg'd with asserting, (p. 19. l. 31.) That Queen *Elizabeth* was deluded by Archbishop *Grindall* to the Toleration of the *Genevian* Discipline, he the said *Henry Sacheverell* saith, he humbly conceives he hath good Authority from the Histories and Monuments of those Times for such Assertion; but whether he hath, or hath not, he humbly apprehends such Assertion to be no Proof of his maintaining or suggesting, That the exempting of Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of *England* from the Penalties of certain Laws, granted by an Act made in the first Year of the Reign of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, (which Exemption he supposes to be intended by the Legal Indulgence or Toleration granted to Dissenters, mention'd in the Preamble of the Articles, and by the Toleration granted by Law, mention'd in this second) is unreasonable, or the Allowance of it unwarrantable; for he is humbly of Opinion, that there is a wide and manifest Difference between a Toleration of the *Genevian* Discipline, and an Exemption of Protestant Dissenters from the Penalties of certain Laws, between a Toleration allow'd merely by the Regal Power, and an Exemption granted by Act of Parliament, which Exemption he is so far from thinking unreasonable or unwarrantable, that from the bottom of his Heart he wisheth it under the same Restriction and Limitations extended to all Her Majesty's Protestant Subjects throughout the whole Kingdom of *Great-Britain*.

And as to such part of the second Article, whereby the said *Henry Sacheverell* is charg'd with scurrilously calling the said Archbishop *Grindall* a *false Son of the Church*, and a *perfidious Prelate*, (p. 19. l. 31.) the said *Henry Sacheverell* humbly hopes that any harsh Expressions he hath us'd concerning the said Prelate may be the rather excus'd, because the said Archbishop having permitted Innovations to be obtruded on the Church, did thereby incur the high Displeasure of so good and pious a Princess as *Queen Elizabeth*, by whose Order he was suspended, and continu'd under such Suspension to the Day of his Death. However, the said *Henry Sacheverell* presumes, that no Words spoken of an Archbishop above 120 Years since deceas'd, will, in Construction of Law, amount to an high Crime and Misdemeanour.

And as to such Part of the Second Article whereby the said *Henry Sacheverell* is charg'd with maintaining, p. 25. l. 20. That it is the Duty of Superior Pastors to thunder out their Ecclesiastical Anathemas against Persons Intitl'd to the Benefit of the said Toleration; He, the said *Henry Sacheverell*, saith, That he doth not maintain, or suggest, that it is the Duty of Superior Pastors to thunder out their Ecclesiastical Anathemas against Persons Intitl'd to the Benefit of the Toleration; which Persons, where he speaks of such Anathemas, are neither by him mention'd nor intended; but if the Expressions by him unapply'd to any, must be determin'd to any one sort of Persons, he humbly conceives, That the Connection of his Discourse will determine them to be those Schismatical and Factionous Persons, p. 25. l. 16. who take Permission for Power, and advance Toleration immediately into an Establishment. And such Schismatical and Factionous Persons he humbly apprehends, are not the Persons Intitl'd to the Benefit of the Act of Exemption, which was design'd only to give some Ease to scrupulous Consciences in the Exercise of their Religion.

And as to the last Part of the second Article whereby the said *Henry Sacheverell* is charg'd with insolently daring of defying any Power on Earth to reverse such Sentences; The said *Henry Sacheverell* saith, p. 25. l. 22. That the Sentences which he the said *Henry Sacheverell* dares any Power on Earth to reverse, is such, and such only as is ratify'd in Heaven, and such Sentence he still affirms to be by any earthly Power irreversibile; and hopes it will not be thought Insolence in him to affirm, what he conceives would be Blasphemy in any one to deny; and doth farther acknowledge himself firmly to believe, that some Sentences pronounc'd by the Pastors of the Church, are ratify'd in Heaven; and that some Persons exempted from Punishment by the particular Laws of the Land, may yet by the Laws of Christ be justly liable to such Sentence; and that Schism, or a causeless Separation from a Church enjoining no sinful Terms of Communion, is a Sin which exposes the Person guilty thereof to the Censures of the Church.

Reflections.

Reflections.

'Tis strange that the Doctor, after a diligent Enquiry, should not be able to find that a Toleration by Law has been granted to Dissenters, when by the 18th of *William and Mary*, Chap. 18. which he himself quotes, 'tis evident that they are not only exempted from the Penalties enacted against them by the former Laws, but allow'd to set up Meetings on the Conditions prescrib'd by the Act. One would be tempted to think that the Doctor understands Grammar as little as he does History, Law or Scripture, or that indeed he is not acquainted with his own Mother Tongue, since every common Mechanick can tell him, that when a Prohibition is remov'd the Thing forbidden is properly said to be tolerated; but he might find by the 18th §. of the Act that those dissenting Meetings are not only tolerated, but defended, and put under the Protection of the Law, and the Disturbers of them made liable to the same Penalties as the Disturbers of Worship in Cathedral or Parish Churches.

Toleration is a Word very well known in *England*, and has been constantly made use of to signify an Exemption from Penal Laws in Matters of Religion; and I believe every one will be ready to grant that the House of Commons, who make use of it in this Article, understand *English* as well as the Doctor. If he thinks that this Word implies more than *Indulgence*, which is that he chuses, 'tis a further Proof of his Ignorance of Grammar; but we have reason to suppose that there's more of Malice than Ignorance at the bottom of this Distinction, and that he thinks it not to be a Law at all, for p. 18. of his Sermon he calls it a religious Liberty indulg'd them by our gracious Sovereign, as if 'twere only an Act of dispensing Power by the Queen. We have the more reason for this Conjecture, because he is very angry with the Dissenters for claiming it as a Civil Right, which certainly they may very well do, since they have all the Right to it which Prince and Parliament can give them, and is as good as that by which any Subject of *Great Britain* holds his Estate. 'Tis plain his Quarrel is not with the Word *Toleration*, for he makes use of it himself in the 15th and 19th Pages of his Sermon in the very Sense which the House of Commons do, viz. for the Act pass'd in the 1st Year of K. *William* and Q. *Mary* to exempt Dissenters from the Penal Laws, and every one knows that an Act of Parliament and a Law are synonymous Terms in *England*; so that his allowing they have a Toleration by the Act of K. *William* and Q. *Mary*, and yet saying at the same time that upon the most diligent Enquiry he has not been able to inform himself that a Toleration has been granted by Law, must necessarily be Nonsense, and Self-contradiction in the Doctor, or else proceed from his looking upon that Act to be no Law, tho' he says he does, and approves it too, for we know

it to be the common Maxim of his Party, That the Convention-Parliament had no Authority to make any, so that this is a new Proof of the Doctor's Enmity to the Revolution, and of his Endeavours to render not only the Means that were us'd to bring it about, but those also made use of to establish it, odious and unjustifiable, and at the same time it discovers the Hypocrisy of his Vindication, when he says that he did not intend to cast the least invidious Reflection upon that Indulgence.

The Falshood of that part of his Vindication is further evident from the whole tenor of his Sermon, and particularly p. 18 and 19, where he gives the Persons entitled to it the Character of a Broad of Vipers, Schismatics, Traitors, False-Brethren, Underminers of the Church, execrable Villains, Men of Hellish Principles, which they openly Profess and Teach, Clamorous, Insatiable, Church-devouring Malignants, Miscreants, begot in Rebellion, born in Sedition, nurs'd up in Faction, &c. All which he expressly applies to the Dissenters in these Pages of his Sermon, which if he believ'd to be true of 'em, he cannot certainly think they ought to be Indulg'd, except he make himself worse than he represents them, and that we may be sure he does not approve the Toleration, in that very same Page he commends Queen Elizabeth for utterly suppressing them by wholesome Severities, and complains that her Successor King James did not follow her wise Politicks in that matter.

So that one wou'd wonder at the Impudence of the Man to say that he has no where maintain'd or suggested their exemption from the Penal Laws, or the indulging of Dissenters to be unreasonable or unwarrantable; but we see that a Spirit of Malice and Falshood are unseparable, since they are both the Offspring of the Devil, who was a Liar and a Murderer from the beginning.

Nay to aggravate the Charge, he tells us in the same Page, That the Dissenters are not to be gain'd by any other Grants or Indulgences than giving up our whole Constitution, and that they threaten the ruin and downfall of our Church and State; so that a more virulent Libel cou'd not be Penn'd in order to raise a Rebellion against the Queen and Parliament on account of the Indulgence, and yet if we will believe him he was not for casting the least invidious Reflection upon it.

The Falshood of his Defence is yet more evident by the 22^d Page of his Sermon, where he says, The Dissenters are guilty of Schism and Faction, which are Things of impudent and inroaching Natures, thrive upon Concessions, take Permission for Power, and advance a Toleration immediately into an Establishment, and are therefore to be treated like growing Mischiefs, or infectious Plagues, kept at a distance lest their deadly Contagion spread, that our Superior Pastors should thunder out their Ecclesiastical Anathemas against them;

them, and as the Commons have truly said, insolently Dares or Defies any Power on Earth to reverse such Sentences.

Nothing could be said with more Violence and Fury to perswade the Queen and Parliament to repeal the Toleration Act, and to make them odious to the People if they did not. This shews the Hypocrisie of his pretended Compassion towards scrupulous Consciences, since he brands the Dissenters in general with such odious Characters, as if they were true, wou'd enforce the necessity of letting loose the old Penal Laws against them, such as that of the 35th of Queen Elizabeth, Chapter the 1st, which oblig'd them either to Conform or Abjure the Realm, and not to return without Licence from the Queen, on pain of being punish'd as Felons, without the benefit of the Clergy, as we know some of 'em were.

The Doctor endeavours to avoid this Charge in the last part of his Answer to the 2d Article, and pretends that he only spoke thus against such Schismatical and factious Persons as he humbly apprehends are not entitled to the Benefit of the Act of Exemption; but the Falshood of that part of his Defence is evident from the Passages of his Sermon that we have quoted already, where he charges all the Dissenters with Schism and Faction.

He endeavours to evade the Charge of ' Calling those Men False Brethren with relation to God, Religion and the Church, who defend Toleration and liberty of Conscience, by alledging that he did not reflect on the Defenders of the legal Exemption or Indulgence, which he himself approves and defends, but on such as defend universal Toleration and Liberty of Conscience, excuse the Separation, and lay the Fault thereof upon the true Sons of the Church, for carrying Matters too high, and such, he conceives, if Members of this Church, to be False Brethren.

This is so weak and trifling, as were it not attended with Malice, might rather deserve Compassion than Censure, but as it reflects upon the Wisdom and Integrity of the Queen and Parliament, there's no Animadversion too severe for it. If King William and Queen Mary, and their Parliament, which pass'd the Toleration Act had not thought the Separation excusable, they wou'd never have exempted the Dissenters from the Penal Laws, and if they had not thought the true Sons of the Church, as he calls them, had carried Matters too high, they wou'd not have restrain'd them by taking off those Laws, according to which they persecuted Dissenters to Imprisonment, Confiscation and Death, and sending them to the Devil into the Bargain by their Anathema's, which the Doctor wou'd fain have in force again. Had not Her Majesty been of the same Opinion, She wou'd never have promis'd from the Throne to maintain the Toleration inviolably.

He

He must be a very great Stranger to History who does not know that King Charles the Second's Act of Uniformity made the Terms of Communion with the Church of England much higher than they were before, and that this was done with a Design to create Divisions among Protestants, in order to make way for Popery and Slavery; 'tis equally well known that the Doctor's true Sons of the Church were very liberal of their Anathema's, in order to ruin the Dissenters by the Writs *de Excommunicato Capiendo*, which follow'd upon them; they also promoted Presentments and Reflections against them in Addresses from all Parts of the Kingdom, and every one knows they were despoil'd of their Goods upon the Oaths of perjur'd Informers, without any Trial, or being confronted with Evidence; if this was not carrying Things too high for Matters, which in the Preface to the Common-Prayer-Book it self, and in the Articles of the Church, are own'd to be indifferent, and alterable, let any Man judge; and since every Body but the Doctor's hot-headed Faction was sensible that these Things brought in Tyranny and Popery upon us like a Deluge, and made Protestants irreconcilable to one another, King William and his Parliament thought it very reasonable to disarm that Party, who had carry'd Things to such an extravagant Height, by taking off the Poenal Laws, and by allowing Dissenters a Liberty to set up Meetings, as the most effectual way to unite the Protestant Subjects in Interest and Affection. But the Falshood of the Doctor's Defence against this part of the Charge is evident from the 10th Page of his Sermon, where he expressly Condemns those for False Brethren without any restriction, who defend Toleration and Liberty of Conscience, and does not so much as except that granted by Law. P. 20. he calls the Toleration 'An indulging of Men in the most mortal Sins; and an exposing of the 'Flock of Christ to the Corruptions of Heresie and Schism, the impostures of false Apostles, and the Deceit and Malice of Wolves in 'Sheeps Cloathing; and p. 23 he is for anathematizing all those who 'advance the Toleration into an Establishment, which certainly includes all the Bishops and Laymen of the Church of England who consented to the establishing of it by Law, as it does all of the same Communion who defend that Establishment. And in the 13th Page of his Derby Sermon he says, that those who authorize Schism, with which in that at St. Paul's he charges all Dissenters in general, are Partakers of other Men's Sins; and in the 14th Page he says, that this, with the other Things mention'd, recoils upon the Person in Authority basely abusing his Power, prostituting the Vicegerency of God to execrable Purposes, betraying his Sacred Trust and Commission, and violating his Faith and Honour. With what Face then can he pretend that he does not call those who defend the Toleration false Brethren, when he arraigns the very Act that establishes it, and the King who pass'd it, as a prostituting of the Vicegerency of God to execrable Purposes.

For

For what relates to Archbishop Grindal, 'tis quite contrary to the Character given of him by B. Goutier, in his *Commentarius de Praefulibus Angliae*; and to that given him by Camden, and not only reflects upon him, but upon most of our other Reformers; and at the same time it fastens the Character of a False Sifter upon the Queen, and of False Brethren upon the Parliament, for Establishing the Genevean Discipline, as he calls it, in Scotland, and making it unalterable, as far as Law can make it so.

ARTICLE III.

He the said Henry Sacheverell, in his said Sermon preach'd at St. Pauls, doth falsely and seditiously suggest and assert, That the Church of England is in a Condition of great Peril and Adversity, under her Majesty's Administration; and in order to arraign and blacken the said Vote or Resolution of both Houses of Parliament, approv'd by Her Majesty aforesaid; he, in Opposition thereto, doth suggest the Church to be in Danger; and as a Parallel, mentions a Vote, That the Person of King Charles was Voted to be out of Danger, at the same time that his Murderers were conspiring his Death; hereby wickedly and maliciously insinuating, That the Members of both Houses, who pass'd the said Vote, were then conspiring the Ruin of the Church.

Answer to the Third Article.

As to so much of the Third Article as charges the said Henry Sacheverell, That he doth falsely and seditiously suggest and assert, That the Church of England is in a Condition of great Peril and Adversity under her Majesty's Administration, and that in order to arraign and blacken the said Vote and Resolution of both Houses of Parliament, approv'd by Her Majesty: He, in opposition thereto, doth suggest the Church to be in Danger. The said Henry Sacheverell denies that he hath either asserted or suggested the Church of England to be in a Condition of great Peril and Adversity under Her Majesty's Administration; but he doth freely acknowledge, That he hath in his Sermon suggested, that when natural Sins are ripen'd up to a full Maturity to call down Vengeance from Providence on a Church and Kingdom, debauch'd in Principles and corrupted in Manners, and instead of the true Faith, Discipline, and Worship, given over to all Licentiousness both in Opinion and Practice, to all Sensuality, Hypocrisy, Lewdness, and Atheism, then we (that is evidently all the Members of such a Church or Kingdom) are in Danger of such deplorable Circumstances. — And this Suggestion of Danger arising to a Church and Kingdom from Vice and Infidelity, he humbly presumes is not opposite to the Vote of the Two Houses, or Seditious, but intirely agreeable to what

is solemnly declar'd in an Act of Parliament made the 9th and 10th Years of his late Majesty King William III. for the more effectual suppressing of Blasphemy and Prophaneness; wherein it is affirm'd that many Persons had of late Years openly avow'd and published many Blasphemous and Impious Opinions, contrary to the Doctrines and Principles of the Christian Religion.

Greatly tending to the Dishonour of Almighty God; which might prove destructive to the Peace and Welfare of this Kingdom. And he conceives that since the Pasing that Act, the detestable Crimes for the effectual suppressing of which, that Act was intended, have greatly increased. And the said Henry Sacheverell saith, the Suggestions by him made of Dangers arising to us from Vice and Infidelity, he apprehends to be in no wise more Seditious or repugnant to the Vote of the Two Houses approv'd by Her Majesty, than the like Suggestions occurring in the solemn Prayers of the Church Authorized by Her Majesty, and frequently Used before each House of Parliament; wherein *We beseech God, That no Seditions may disturb this State, nor Schism distract this Church, and that he would give us Grace seriously to lay to Heart the great Danger we are in by our unhappy Divisions.*

And as to so much of the said Third Article, whereby 'tis charged that the said Henry Sacheverell, as a Parallel mentions a Vote, *That the Person of King Charles the P. 21. L. 6. First was Voted to be out of Danger, at the same time that his Murderers were conspiring his Death;* thereby Wickedly and Maliciously Insinuating that the Members of both Houses who passed the said Vote, were then conspiring the Ruin of the Church. He the said Henry Sacheverell doth say, that he doth not draw any Parallel between the Vote concerning the King's Person, and the late Vote of the Two Houses, which he neither there, nor elsewhere in his Sermon mentions. But had he suggested one Vote to be parallel to the other, which he hath not, yet would he not thereby have Wickedly and Maliciously insinuated that the Members of both Houses who passed the late Vote, were then Conspiring the Ruin of the Church, but would only have Intimated, that as some Persons were conspiring the Murder of the King, whilst others no ways privy to their Wicked Intentions, Voted *His Person to be out of Danger;* so when the Two Houses Voted the Church of England to be in no Danger under Her Majesty's Administration, there might be some others who were conspiring the Ruin of the Church. And many others who by their Vice and Infidelity were drawing down God's Vengeance, both in Church and Kingdom.

As the Vote of both Houses made Four Years ago, did concern those only who did then insinuate, the Church of England

to be in danger, under her Majesty's Administration, so it cannot; he presumes, affect those who do now suggest the Christian Faith, which is the Foundation upon which every Christian Church stands, so be Endangered by those Atheistical and Irreligious Principles which are daily from the Press, propagated among us. Notwithstanding the Provisions made by the said Act for suppressing Blasphemy and Profaneness. So that the said Henry Sacheverell thinks, that he might with Truth affirm (as he did in his Sermon Preach'd at Derby) That there were never such Outragious Blasphemies against God, and all Religion Natural as well as Revealed, vented Publicly with Impunity, in any Christian Church or Kingdom in the whole World, as at present in our own, of which Assertion the said Henry Sacheverell is ready to produce undeniable and ample Proofs, if call'd thereto.

REFLECTIONS.

THE Dr. Answer to this Article is full of notorious Prevarication, as appears by the Dedication of his Derby Sermon, where he says, 'the Principles and Interest of our Church are shamefully betray'd and run down, and persecuted with open Violence, which certainly reflects on her Majesty's Administration, as well as on her Veracity, and that of our Grand Senate, since her Majesty and both Houses of Parliament have so solemnly declar'd, that they are hers, and the Nations greatest Enemies who assert the Church to be in danger under her Administration. The Falshood of this part of his Defence is also plain, 1. From what we have just now quoted out of him as to the authorizing of Schism by the Toleration. 2. By the Dedication of his Sermon at St. Paul's, where he says, 'That Truth is oppressed by Number and Noise, and rebellious Appeals made to the People, &c. which are the fashionable Methods now made use of to over-bear and silence our Church; that our Constitution is in danger when so rigorously attack'd from without, and so lazily defended from within; and that the Persons of those who would defend the Church and State are in hazard. 3. By p. 7. of the Sermon, where he says, 'The Church of England like that of Corinth has her Holy Communion rent and divided by Factions and Schismatical Impostors, her pure Doctrine corrupted and defild, her Primitive Worship and Discipline profan'd and abus'd, her Altars and Sacraments prostituted to Hypocrites, Deists, Soci-nians and Atheists, I wish I could not say without Discouragement, but I'm sure without Impunity, not only by our profess'd Enemies, but which is worse, by our pretended Friends and false Brethren. 4. By p. 9. where he reflects upon the Bishop of Salisbury's Exposition of the Articles. 5. By p. 15. Where he says, 'That false Brethren do

not singly and in private, but in public, and in the face of the sun, he speaks, and suffers to mention into Churches and Synagogues, wherein Atholm, Deism, Trithem, Socinianism, with all the heathen Principles of Paganism, Regicide and Atheism, are openly profess'd and taught to corruption and debauch the Youth of the Nation in all Parts, and down to Posterity, in the present Reproach and public Contempt of the Laws and Religion. 26. By insinuating in that same Page, and Part of the English Government is trusted in persons of other Principles than those of the Church of England, which endangers the being of it. 27. By p. 26. Where he says, 'Our false Brethren, by a spurious and villainous Notion, and a wild Negative Idea of a National Church, have undermin'd the very essential Constitution of it, that such is her hard Fortune, her worst Adversaries must be let into her Bowels under the Holy Umbrage of Sense, who neither believe her Faith, own her Mission, submit to her Discipline, or comply with her Liturgy, that her Walls and Inclosures are pull'd down, and a high Road made in upon her Communion, and this pure Spouse of Christ is prostituted to more Adulterers than the Scarlet Whore in the Revelations, with a great deal more of such Ribaldry, as is offensive to modest Ears. 28. By p. 27. Where he says, 'That since the false Brethren could not easily the Conventicle into the Church, they are now resolv'd to bring the Church into the Conventicle, which will more plausibly and sily effect her Ruin; what could not be gain'd by Comprehension and Toleration, must be brought about by Moderation and Occasional Conformity; that the false Brethren crucify the Church as the Jews did our Saviour betwixt Thieves. 9. By p. 28. Where he insinuates, that false Brethren are intrusted with the Guardianship of our Church and Crown, and would have our Governors not consider it, that they juggle the Church out of her Establishment by hoisting the Toleration into its Place. 10. p. 29. Where he says, 'That they have undermined the Foundations of the Church, and endanger the Government by filling it with its profane Enemies; and these Charges he pretends to be flagrant, and undeniable. 11. By p. 20. Where he says, 'They are contriving, and plotting our utter Ruin; and that the false Brethren, who fall in with those Measures, basely contribute towards it. In that same Page he expresses himself thus, 'And now are we in no Danger under these deplorable Circumstances, must we hush our selves under this sad Repose, and in such stupid Lethargick Security embrace our Ruin? I pray God we may be out of Danger; but we may remember the King's Person was voted to be so at the same time that his Murderers were conspiring his Death. 12. By p. 21. Where he says, 'Men of Character, and Stations, start from their Religion upon any occasion of difficulty. 13. By p. 23. Where he says, 'We are unhappy Sharers of St. Paul's Misfortune to have our Church in Peril of false Brethren.

Now

Now since he himself says that all those Charges are flagrant and undeniable, was there ever a more malicious and villanous Libel drawn up against the Administration of any Prince in the World? Does not this reflect upon the Queen, the Bishops, the Parliament, and all the Magistrates in *England*; or could Envy it self draw a more horrid Picture of the moderate Clergy and Laity of the Church of *England*? Certainly this Man must be arriv'd to the highest pitch of Falshood that the corrupt Nature of Human Race is capable of, to deny, after such a Charge as this, which every one may see in his Sermons, that he had either *asserted* or *suggested* the Church of *England* to be in a condition of great Peril and Adversity under Her Majesties Administration. His recourse to the Act of 9 & 10 *W. 3.* for the more effectual suppressing of Blasphemy and Prophaneness, wherein 'tis affirmed, *That many persons had of late years openly avowed and published many blasphemous and impious Opinions*, can stand him in no stead, but, on the contrary, convicts him of Falshood; since 'tis very well known that Her Majesty has issu'd Proclamations for putting that Law, and others of the like nature, in execution. At the same time, it may be justly observed, that it becomes Him the worst of all Men to draw up such a Charge against the Government, since in his *Derby-Sermon* he did so maliciously inveigh against the *Societies for Reformation of Manners*, as "dextrous refin'd Hypocrites, and Knaves, who turn the World upside down, and set all Mankind into Quarrels and Confusions, p. 8." and ranks them with "Murtherers, Thieves, and Malefactors, Liars, Slanderers, Whisperers, Backbiters, and Tale-bearers, the most expresse Character of the Devil, who is emphatically stil'd *the grand Accuser of the Brethren.*" Was not this, as much as in him lay, to hinder the Reformation of the Vices he complains of, and loads the Queens Administration, as if she suffer'd them to pass with Impunity? Let the Doctor and his Advocates consider then, whether the most expresse Character of the Devil be more applicable to *Himself*, or to the *Societies of Reformation*.

The *Prayer of the Church* which he mentions, is so far from defending him, that it perfectly condemns him; for there's nothing in it which charges the State with encouraging Seditions or Schisms, as he does throughout his Sermon; but is an infallible proof that he has never obtain'd the Grace there pray'd for, *seriously to lay to heart the great Danger we are in by our unhappy Divisions*, since for so many years he has acted the part of an Incendiary to foment them; and we have the Judgment of the whole Commons of *Great-Britain* against him in that matter, founded upon undeniable Proofs from his own Sermons.

His denying that he made any Parallel betwixt the Vote, *That the Person of King Charles I. was out of Danger, at the same time that his*

Murderers were conspiring his Death, and the Vote of the Two Houses, That the Church was under no Danger under Her Majesties Administration, can stand him in little stead; for no body else is able to find a Reason why he shou'd mention them together, if he did not design a Parallel, and to insinuate that the One was as false as the Other; for he has, throughout his whole Sermon, endeavour'd to prove that the Church is in imminent Danger, and reflects upon the Toleration Act, the rejecting of the Occasional Bill, and the profess'd Moderation of Her Majesty, Her Ministry, and of those call'd the Low-Church Clergy and Laity, whom he odiously brands with the Name of False Brethren, as the principal Occasions of that suppos'd Danger.

He verifies the Proverb, that *there's a sort of men in the world who stand in need of good Memories*, otherwise he could not have forgot what he has so violently asserted, "That our Church and Constitution are shamefully betray'd and run down, persecuted with open Violence, vigorously attack'd from without, and lazily defended from within; That False Brethren are intrusted with the Guardianship of our Church and Crown; That the Government is fill'd with its profess'd Enemies; That the Church's Walls and Inclosures are pull'd down, &c. with Impunity; and that those Charges are flagrant and undeniable." Then how can this be possible, that the Two Houses should pass such a Vote, and the Queen approve it, against such flagrant and undeniable proof according to him, if they were not in a Conspiracy to bring about the Danger of the Church, which they voted had no being? Does the Doctor and his Faction think that all the Nation, except Themselves, are under a judicial Blindness, like that of Sodom; and that He and his Party, like Lot and his Family, are the only persons who have escap'd that Judgment? The People of Great Britain will expect a better proof of the Purity of their Doctrine and Morals than hitherto they have been able to give 'em, before they can believe that the High-Church Faction are the only People entitl'd to a such Blessing.

Who gave him a power to explain the Vote of Both Houses, as if it related only to persons who insinuated the Church to be in Danger four years ago? But supposing it to be so, was not He himself one of those persons; and has he not made it his business ever since to increase their number, by the like malicious and groundless Suggestions? If he will not allow this Vote to look forward, he can't well deny it a retrospect; and of what use that will be to him, let his Seditious Sermons preach'd and publish'd at Oxford determin: Nay, if all be true that is said, there are some of those who, perhaps, may be qualified to be part of his Judges, that heard the very Sermon from him now under Censure, several years ago.

As

As to the growth of those Atheistical and Irreligious Principles, which are daily propagated from the Press, how can he charge the Government with them, when he owns himself there's an Act against them, and that the Queen has publish'd a Proclamation, as has been said already, for putting that Law in execution? Why have not his High-Church Justices of Peace acted according to that Proclamation? Why did He himself brand the Societies of Reformation as *Devils incarnate* for endeavouring to do it, give them the modest Title of *the Grand Deceiver's Privy-Council*, in the 10th page of his *Derby-Sermon*, and of *Sanctified Villains*, p. 8.? Some are apt to think that his Instance of *Moses*, p. 9. who kill'd the *Egyptian* that wrong'd one of his Brethren, considering what went before and follows against Informers and the Societies of Reformation, was brought in as an Argument to justify the Murder of Mr. *Dent* the Constable. Perhaps there may be something of ill Nature in this: but the Doctor is not so remarkable for the Meekness of his Temper, as to make it altogether improbable.

Why did not the Doctor advise his Superior Pastors to thunder out their Anathemas against the Propagators of the Atheistical and Irreligious Books that he mentions? Or does he think it a proper way to stop the Torrent of such Impieties, and to lessen the growth of Atheism, to damn all those to the *Lake that burns with Fire and Brimstone*, who dissent from the Church in such things as She herself owns to be indifferent? Is not this a prostituting the Vicegerency of God, betraying his Sacred Trust and Commission, and violating his Faith and Honour, when He himself acts contrary to the Articles of the Church, and to the Office of a Priest, who is to teach nothing but what he is perswaded may be proved by Scripture? Has the Word of God or our Church any where taught that Men must be damn'd for dissenting in things indifferent, or that the Legislature must run the same risk for indulging them? Yet, if we believe the Doctor, they have made themselves liable to this punishment by authorising damnable Schism. Whether he allow it to be a Toleration or not, 'tis all one, for we have his word for it in the 6th page of his *Derby-Sermon*, That a tacit Admission in any one who has the Right of Prohibition, amounts to an Approbation of any thing in the sense of the whole World, and involves the person so consenting under a double Guilt, both as being a party concern'd in the Sin, and a Traitor of his Authority. Will the Doctor own at last then, that a Prince may be a Traitor to his Authority? If he be so, he is a Traitor to the Laws which gave it him. The Royal Martyr King *Charles I.* own'd in his Declaration from *Newmarket*, That the Law is the Measure of his Power; and in another to the Ministers and Freeholders of *York*, That his Prerogatives are built upon the Law of the Land; which if it be true, as certainly it is, then a King may be a Traitor

to his People; for, that the Lords and Commons of Great Britain chuse their own Laws, is not to be deny'd, tho' the Royal Assent be necessary to confirm them. Thus we see the unhappy Man has his Brains so disturb'd with the Fumes of Malice and Sedition, that he is not sensible when he falls into Contradictions; for in his *Derby-Sermon* he has granted a Point which he endeavour'd to explode in that at *St. Paul's*, viz. That there can be no Treason against any but the King, and at the same time he has own'd a Toleration to be granted by Law; which he denies in his Answer; for, if a *tacit Admission* of the Legislature be an *Approbation* in the sense of the whole World, much more must a positive Act, like that for allowing the Dissenters their Meeting-Houses, and giving them the Protection of the Law to secure them from being disturb'd. Besides, every one must own that *Approbation* includes a great deal more than *Toleration*, for in many Cases a Man will *tolerate* what he can by no means *approve*: So that here the Doctor falls under his own Lash, for advancing the Toleration into an approv'd Establishment by our Legislature.

But to proceed with his Civility to the Government: He tells us in the same page of his *Derby-Sermon*, "Certainly any person in Authority does much more contribute to the advancement of Evil by a permissive Silence and passive Forbearance, than an Inferior can in the most vigorous expression of his Zeal and Fervency for it, because by Him Vice seems to be legitimated, as 'twere establish'd by a Law, and to have its current Passport without control in the World."

Now let any Man who lays these things together deny, if he can, that the Doctor has condemn'd the Queen and Parliament as Traitors who have prostituted the Vicegerency of God, by indulging Schism, and by suffering his flagrant and undeniable Proofs of a Plot to ruin the Church and State, to pass with Impunity.

ART. IV.

He the said Henry Sacheverell, in his Sermons and Books, doth falsely and maliciously suggest, That her Majesties Administration, both in Ecclesiastical and Civil Affairs, tends to the Destruction of the Constitution, and that there are Men of Characters and Stations in Church and State, who are False Brethren; and do themselves weaken, undermine and betray; and do encourage and put it into the power of others, who are profess'd Enemies, to overturn and destroy the Constitution and Establishment, and chargeth her Majesty, and those in Authority under her, both in Church and State, with a general Maladministration; and, as a publick Incendiary, he persuades

swades her Majesties Subjects to keep up a Distinction of Factions and Parties; instils groundless Jealousies, foment destructive Divisions among them, and excites and stirs them up to Arms and Violence; and that his said malicious and seditious Suggestions may make the stronger Impressions upon the Minds of her Majesties Subjects, he the said Henry Sacheverell doth wickedly wrest and pervert divers Texts and Passages of holy Scripture.

All which Crimes and Misdemeanors the Commons are ready to prove, not only by the general Scope of the said Sermons or Books, but likewise by several Clauses and Sentences, and Expressions in the said Sermons or Books contain'd; and that the said Henry Sacheverell, by preaching the Sermons, and publishing the Books aforesaid, did abuse his Holy Function, and hath most grievously offended against the Peace of her Majesty, her Crown and Dignity, the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, the Laws and Statutes of this Kingdom, and the Prosperity and good Government of the same. And the said Commons, by Protestation saving themselves the liberty of exhibiting at any time hereafter any other Articles or Impeachment against the said Henry Sacheverell, and also of replying to his Answer, or any of them, and of offering Proofs of all the premisses, or any of them, and of any other Article or Impeachment that shall be exhibited by them, as the Case according to Course of Parliament shall require, do pray that the said Henry Sacheverell may be put to answer to all and every the premisses; and that such Proceedings, Examination, Trial, Judgment, and exemplary Punishment may be thereupon had and executed, as is agreeable to Law and Justice.

Ans^r. As to the Fourth Article, it contains several Charges of a very high and criminal nature, which the said Henry Sacheverell knows his heart to be entirely innocent; and he observes with comfort, that whereas in the former Three Articles he is said to have maintained or asserted, as well as to have suggested the Doctrines therein laid to his Charge, in this Fourth Article he is not accused of maintaining or asserting, but barely of suggesting what is therein contained; and he humbly hopes that bare Suggestions or Insinuations, could they with any colour or probability be made out, as he is fully satisfy'd they cannot, will not, under the most mild and gracious Government, (at a time when several new Laws have been made for the securing the Liberties of the Subject by Your Lordships, the great Guardians of our Laws and Liberties) be adjudged sufficient to involve an English Subject in the Guilt and Punishment of High Crimes and Misdemeanors.

To

To the several parts of the said Fourth Article, the said Henry Sacheverell doth in all humility answer, as to such part thereof whereby it is charged that the said Henry Sacheverell in his said Sermons and Books, doth falsely and maliciously suggest that her Majesties Administration, both in Ecclesiastical and Civil Affairs, tends to the Destruction of the Constitution: He the said Henry Sacheverell saith, That he hath not made any mention in either of his Books or Sermons of her Majesties Administration in Ecclesiastical or Civil Affairs, or of her Ministers; So far is he from suggesting that her Majesties Administration both in Ecclesiastical and Civil Affairs tends to the Destruction of the Constitution, that amongst the inestimable Blessings which are owing to our Deliverance annually commemorated on the Fifth of November, he reckons this to be one, That Her Majesty, the good and pious Relict of the Royal Family, sits now happily upon the Throne of Her Ancestors; and prays that God may long preserve Her for the Comfort and Support of the Church; and professeth that what he spoke proceeded from a tender Concern for Her Majesties Person and Government; and in the Dedication also of his Sermon preached at St. Pauls, solemnly declares, as he did before in his Discourse, That his only aim and intention was earnestly to contend for the Safety, Right and Establishment of Her Majesty, together with those of the Church.

As to such part of the said Fourth Article, whereby it is charged, That Henry Sacheverell doth suggest that there are Men of Characters and Stations in the Church, who are False Brethren: The said Henry Sacheverell saith, That the False Brethren, as described by him in his Sermon, are either those who propagate False Doctrines, or who give up the Discipline and Worship of the Church, or who are for a Neutrality in Religion, or who wish well to the Church of England, and are ready to sacrifice their Persons and Estates in Her Vindication, but do not shew their Zeal in the Communion of the Church as well as for it, in obeying Her Precepts as well as defending her Rights. These being the several sorts of False Brethren enumerated by the said Henry Sacheverell, if he should have suggested that there are Men of Characters and Stations in Church and State, (Words by no means restrained to the highest Characters and Stations) to whom the denomination of False Brethren in some one or more senses of that Word, as by him interpreted, doth belong, he humbly hopes that such suggestions would not be deem'd False, Malicious, or highly Criminal.

And as to such other part of the said Fourth Article, whereby it is charged, That the said Henry Sacheverell doth suggest that there are Men of Characters and Stations in Church and State, who do themselves weaken, undermine and betray, and do encourage and put into the power of others who are professed Enemies, to overturn and destroy the Constitution and Establishment:

Dissonant: The said *Henry Sacheverell* denies that he suggesteth any such things concerning Men of Characters and Stations in the Church or State, where he speaks of those who weaken, undermine and betray, and encourage, and put it in the power of our professed Enemies to overturn and destroy the Constitution and Establishment; here Men of Characters and Stations are not mentioned by him: And where he mentions Men of Characters and Stations twelve Pages afterwards, the only place wherein he mentions them, there he speaks nothing of weakening, undermining and betraying, or of encouraging, and putting it into the power of our professed Enemies, to overturn and destroy our Constitution and Establishment; and hopes therefore that he shall be no ways answerable for a supposed Reflection which depends upon the connexions of passages so widely distant from, and so little relating to each other. The Weakners, Underminers and Betrayers of our Constitution, and the Encouragers to whom the said *Henry Sacheverell* doth in any part of his Sermon refer, will, he presumes, upon a candid examination of those passages, appear to be one of these three sorts of persons: Either, first, such as by their Writings endeavour to subvert the Foundation of our Church and State; Or, secondly, such, whether Writers or others, who are for a Latitudinarian Heterogeneous mixture of all persons, of what different Faith soever, omitting only in *Protestantism*; which would let into her Bowels those who neither believe her Faith, own her Mission, submit to her Discipline, or comply with her Liturgy, which he afterwards styles *the Model of an Universal Confession*; or, thirdly, those Occasional Conformists, who have so far eluded the Corporation and Test-Acts by their abominable Hypocrisie, as to have undermined the Foundation, and endanger'd the Government, by filling it (as far as they could) with its profess'd Enemies, that is, with Themselves. Of all these, and their Encouragers, the said *Henry Sacheverell* confesses himself to have suggested that they do, in his opinion, weaken, undermine, and betray the Constitution: But that either These, or their Encouragers, are Men of Characters or Stations in the Church or State, he hath not any where suggested.

And as to such other Part of the 4th Article, which Chargeth the said *Henry Sacheverell* with Charging Her Majesty and those in Authority under Her, both in Church and State, with a general Maladministration: The said *Henry Sacheverell*, saith, that he abhors the Thoughts of bringing any charge against Her Sacred Majesty, whom he never mentions but in terms of the profoundest Duty and Respect. Nor doth he Tax those in Authority with a General or with a Maladministration, which is a Word he hath never us'd, nor as far as he can find any other Word or Words by which the Thing is imply'd: So far is the said *Henry Sacheverell* from making any Undutifull Reflection on Her Majesty

Self or Her Administration, that in the several Writings, that he has published, since Her happy Accession to the Throne, particularly in one (which is an avow'd Defence of Her Title to the Crown, and a Justification of Her entering into a War with France and Spain,) he hath expressed himself with the most hearty and Loyal Zeal for her Majesties Person, Government and Administration.

And as to such other Part of the said Fourth Article, whereby it is charged, That the said Henry Sacheverell, as a publick Incendiary persuades Her Majesties Subjects to keep up a Distinction of Factions and Parties, the said Henry Sacheverell saith, That he is so far from being guilty of this Charge, That in his said Sermon he invites the Separatists to renounce their Schism, and come sincerely into the Church, and complains of those who have villainously divided us with the Knavish Distinctions of High and Low Church Men; and wishes we might have one Fold under one Shepherd, and that all those invidious Distinctions, that now distract and confound us, were lost, so that we might be terrible like an Army with Banners to our Enemies, who could never break in upon such an uniform and well compacted Body.

And as to such other part of the said Fourth Article, as charges, That the said Henry Sacheverell instills groundless Jealousies, and foment destructive Divisions among Her Majesty's Subjects: The said Henry Sacheverell saith, That in his said Sermon, he on the contrary, Rebukes, and Condemns those who by false Insinuations, and raising groundless Jealousies and Fears, imbroider the Publick, and bring it into Confusion.

And as to such other part of the said Fourth Article, whereby it is charged, That the said Henry Sacheverell excites and stirs up Her Majesty's Subjects to Arms and Violence; The said Henry Sacheverell saith, God forbid that he should be Guilty of so heinous a Crime, who asserts the utter Illegality of Resistance of the Supreme Power upon any Pretence whatsoever; which Assertion he conceives to be the Chief, if not only Ground of the Charge exhibited against him in the First Article.

In Confutation of this Charge, he begs leave to recite one Passage out of his Sermon preached at Derby in the following Words: We may be Partakers of other Mens Sins; if we do not to the utmost of our Power endeavour to prevent or obstruct their Commission, when they manifestly endanger the Good of the Publick. As we are Members of any Government or Society, we are all obliged in point of Honour, Interest and Conscience, to maintain its Security, promote its Welfare, and guard it

It against factious Designs, or seditious Conspiracies that may threaten its Constitution, discompose its Peace, or violate and subvert its Laws. God and Nature hath invested every Subject from his Cradle, with a Commission to engage, Discover and Disappoint the Enemies of his Church and Country; and he that is either privy to, or industriously conceals, or any way abetts their Schismatical, Illegal, or Rebellious Enterprizes, both in the Eyes of Human, as well as Divine Law is an Accomplice and Partaker in the Guilt; a Traytor to God and his Prince; a Patron and Protector of Injustice, and a common Adversary to himself as well as all Mankind. And the said Henry Sacheverell hopes, what he hath said in the Dedication of the same Sermon. That there are not wanting some to Preach the Truth, and others to support it at the Expence of their Lives and Fortunes, will not be construed as exciting Her Majesties Subjects to Sedition and Rebellion, since that Truth which he commends some for Preaching, and others for Supporting, is by him opposed to the Attempts of those who betray and run down the Principles and Interests of our Church and Constitution; and since he then deservedly Commends the High Sheriff of that County, on the Account of his Steady Loyalty and Zeal to serve Her Majesty and the Government, for which he hath been so remarkably distinguished.

In the Sermon Preached at St. Paul's, he doth indeed Excite Christians to put on the whole Armour of God, as wrestling, not only against Flesh and Blood, but against Principalities, against Powers, against the Rulers of the Darknes of this World; against spiritual Wickedness in high Places. But he hath learned from the same Saint Paul, That the Arms of Resistance taken up by Subjects against the higher Powers, are not part of the spiritual Armour, and the Principalities and Powers by him mention'd, being plainly distinguished from Flesh and Blood, cannot, he thinks, be so far misinterpreted as to be understood of Earthly Potentates and Rulers.

And as to so much of the said Fourth Article, whereby it is charged that he the said Henry Sacheverell doth wickedly wrest and pervert divers Texts and Passages of holy Scripture, that his said malicious and seditious suggestions may make the stronger Impression upon the minds of Her Majesty's Subjects: The said Henry Sacheverell says, That having no malicious or seditious Suggestions to Imprint, he could not intend to wrest any Passages of Holy Scripture to that wicked Purpose. Hard is the Lot of the Ministers of the Gospel, if when they cite the Word of God in their general Exhortations to Piety and Virtue, or in their Reproofs of Mens Transgressions, or where they are Lamenting the Difficulty and Conflicts with which the Church of Christ, whilst Militant here on Earth, must always struggle, the several Texts

and Passages by them Cited, shall be said to have been by them meant of particular Persons and Things, and shall be Construed in the most Criminal Sense, and be made by such Construction one Ground of an Impeachment, for high Crimes and Misdemeanors!

And as to all other Matters and Things in the said Articles contain'd, and not herein before particularly answered unto, the said Henry Sacheverell saith, he is not Guilty of them, or any of them in Manner or Form, as the same are charged upon him, in and by the said Articles, and humbly submits himself to your Lordships Judgment.

R E F L E C T I O N S.

The Confutation of the *Doctor's Answer* to the *Fourth Article* is in a great measure anticipated by what has been said already to the other *Three*; and particularly as to that part of the Charge, that Her Majesties Administration, both in Ecclesiastical and Civil Affairs, tends to the Destruction of the Constitution. We have already mentioned the particulars both as to Omission and Commission, which he charges upon the Administration; so that 'tis needless to repeat them: And since he tells us that those particulars are flagrant and undeniable, we shall make use of his own Arguments to prove how far Her Majesties Administration is guilty according to him. The first is *Commanding or Commissioning their Execution*, as he expresses it in his *Derby Sermon*. P. 4. Now that Her Majesty has commanded Moderation once and again from the Throne among Her Protestant Subjects, who differ from one another, and that she has solemnly declar'd, she will inviolably maintain the Toleration, is evident to all the World, which is equal to a Commission for putting that Law in Execution; and how much the Doctor says these things indanger Church and State, has been taken notice of before. 'Tis also known that our House of Lords rejected the Bill of Occasional Conformity three times Successively, and this the Doctor in the 17th Page of his Sermon at *St. Pauls*, says, "is to blow up the Church, if it can't be pull'd down, and no matter with these Men how 'tis destroy'd, so that 'tis destroy'd. I believe this is the first instance of such Treatment to the House of Lords by any Criminal that ever was brought before them, and is such an Affront as no Judge upon Earth wou'd bear. This makes their Lordships answerable for letting in those Men of Characters and Stations into the State, as the Doctor says, come in with a design to overturn and destroy the Constitution and Establishment, and likewise for the Consequences of that Scandalous Fluctuation, as he names it, betwixt the Church and Dissenters, which he calls upon his Hearers, in the Name of God, fairly to consider, and in that same Page he says, " 'Tis a Curtailling, Mangling, and Suiting our Religion to the Pride, Humours, Caprice,

" Caprice, and Qualm Sick-Stomachs of Obstinate, Moody, Way-
 " ward, and Self-conceited Hypocrites and Enthusiasts; and that the
 " end of all this is to establish Heresie and Erastianism upon the Ruins
 " of our Faith and Discipline; that this Spiritual Legerdemain,
 " this fallacious Tricking and Double-Dealing will Eradicate all the
 " Principles of Truth, Honesty or Piety out of Mens Minds, &c.
 " and make them all Atheists or Papists; and thus our False Brethren,
 " as the Jews did our blessed Saviour, Crucify his Church betwixt
 " Thieves: Let the World judge then if any thing more Malicious
 " could be said against Her Majesties Administration and the House of
 " Lords. The Doctor endeavours to evade this Charge, by alledging
 " that if he should have suggested that there are Men of Characters
 " and Stations in Church and State, 'tis by no means to be restrain'd
 " to the highest Characters and Stations; but it seems he has forgot
 " what he says of the same Persons afterwards, P. 18. viz. " That
 " they are as much Occasional Loyalists to the State, as Occasional
 " Conformists to the Church, that is, they will betray either when
 " ever 'tis in their Power, and they think it for their Advantage;
 " Falsehood, says he, always implies Treachery; and whether that
 " is a Qualification for any one to be trusted, *especially with the Guar-*
 " *dianship of our Church or Crown,* let our Governors consider. But
 " whether the Guardians of our Church and Crown are not Men of
 " the highest Characters and Stations, let the Doctor and his Advocates
 " consider, and give us a Reason why he should propose it to the Con-
 " sideration of the Government, if he did not think there were such
 " Persons actually in the highest Characters and Stations; but further,
 " P. 19. he speaks of some " who have eluded the Corporation and Test
 " Acts, by their abominable Hypocrisy, so far as to have under-
 " min'd the Foundations of the Church, and indanger the Govern-
 " ment, by filling in with its profess'd Enemies; and instead of ex-
 " pressing this dubiously, he asserts positively that these Charges are
 " flagrant and undeniable. Is it possible then for the Malice of Man
 " to Charge Her Majesties Administration more heavily than with
 " flagrant and undeniable Proofs that the Church and Crown are un-
 " der the Guardianship of False Brethren, and that the Government
 " is fill'd with its profess'd Enemies?

" We also know, and no doubt the House of Lords remember, that
 " when the Debate about the Occasional Bill was before them, there
 " were several of the highest Stations both in Church and State, who
 " argued against it; but it seems the Doctor has forgot how he rails
 " upon those Spiritual and Temporal Lords for doing so, " as false
 " both to God and Religion, and says, That they shall be called
 " hereafter the least in the Kingdom of Heaven, how great soever
 " they may be in the Kingdoms here below; which is a plain Proof

he aim'd the Reflection at some of the highest Station in the Church : And every one understands at whom he levell'd his Malice in his 9th Page, where he charges one " with explaining the great *Credenda* " of our Faith, in new fangled Terms of Modern Philosophy, with " publishing a new Gospel, ungodding his Saviour, destroying his " Revelation, unsettling the receiv'd Doctrine of the Church, and " giving up Christianity to Scepticism and Atheism. Now if there be any such Person or Persons in the House of Lords, the Doctor has ro'd all their Lordships in his *Derby Sermon*, Page 4. That they are guilty of the same Sins, by conniving at or concealing them, and that the Queen and they are guilty of a double Guilt, by a Permissive Silence, and Passive Forbearance; and that her Majesty and they are Traitors to their Authority, and do much more contribute to the Advancement of the Evil, than that Inferior Person can by the most vigorous Expression of his Zeal and Fervency for it, as the Doctor expresses it in the 6th Page of that Sermon: He may also remember that he charges them all, Page 10. of his *St. Paul's Sermon*, with being false to the Interest of the Church for giving up Points of Discipline and Worship to the Dissenters; since, Page 19. he says, it hardens, encourages, and justifies the Separatists in their Separation, when they see such large Allowances and Concessions made in its Favour, as he says there are granted by Moderation, Toleration, and Occasional Conformity; and we all know very well who he means by the Ecclesiastical *Achitophels*, that projected a Scheme to Ruin the Church, to make it a Den of Thieves and a Chaos, which he says, was defeated by the Interposition of Providence, Page 16.

What the Doctor alleges in his Justification against that Part of the Charge, which accuses him with charging Her Majesty and those in Authority under her, both in Church and State, with a general Male-Administration, is fully answer'd by what has been said already; his Sermon and Writings, which he Appeals to for his having defended Her Majesties Title, &c. can be no Defence of his contrary Practices since, but may serve for a Caution to his bigotted Admirers, to fear God and honour the Queen, and not to meddle with such Men as he, who are given to Change, and especially for the worse. This he has certainly done by falling in with those who are for bringing us under a Popish Prince and a French Government, the latter of which he so well exposed in the Sermon he refers to.

His Defence against the Charge, That as a publick Incendiary he perswaded Her Majesties Subject to keep up a distinction of Factions and Parties, is as faint as 'tis false, for instead of inviting Separatists

tists to renounce their Sin, and come into the Church, he expresses the greatest Rage that can be against them, loads them with such reproachful Names as wou'd be a scandal to *Billingsgate* or the *Bear-Garden*, and instead of the Apostolical Order, to forbear to judge other Mens Consciences, he charges them with the blackest Hypocrisie and Treachery, and is so far from advising to any gentle Methods of convincing them, that he manifestly advises their Extermination, and blackens them with such a Catalogue of Crimes, as Reflect the greatest Disgrace on the State for indulging them; and as if that were not enough, he wou'd have them sent to the Devil by Excommunication.

But further, he not only rails at the Dissenters of *England* as Separatists, but reviles the Church of *Scotland*, which is as firmly established by Law as that of *England*, what else does he mean by his Mungrel Union of all Sects, Schismatical Presbyters, without Episcopal Ordination, which Unchurches the very Church, Page 10? And since the *Scots* have not only separated from, but turn'd out their Bishops, he concludes them to be under a damnable Schism, and wou'd have the world to believe that the Queen and Parliament of *England* have made an Union with a People who are in a State of Damnation. With what Face then can this Man complain of others for villainously dividing us with Knavish Distinctions, when his own Sermons are such Originals in that kind as perhaps the World never saw? How does he abuse all those who are not of his own way, be they Churchmen or Dissenters, as Neutralists in Religion, "a Secret sort of reserv'd Atheists, wretched, empty, hypocritical Sophisters, impudent, boasting, Self-conceited Pretenders, Schismatical Impostors, Upstart Novelists, Self-conceited Enthusiasts, Sectarists, Scepticks, Sly-Saints, Gallios, Canting-Fellows, Incendiaries, Men of Villanous and Seditious Principles, filthy Dreamers, Presumptuous and Self-will'd Men, Despisers of Dominion and Government, a brood of Vipers, Regicides, insidious, Treacherous, and false-hearred Knaves, Pagan-Beasts, unhallow'd, loathsome and detestable Guests, Scandalous Trimmers, Innovators, Headstrong encroaching Monsters, excentrick Comets, growing Mischiefs, infectious Plagues, the worst of Dæmons, Conformists in Profession, half Conformists in Practice, and Non-conformists in Judgment! And when he has made up this lovely Bundle, he very mercifully throws 'em all into the Lake that burns with Fire and Brimstone, with the grand Father of Falshood, the Devil and his Angels, and thus he pretends to leave his False Brethren in the Company they always keep Correspondence with.

Certainly he has given the Nation sufficient Reason to give off calling foul Language by the usual Name of *Billingsgate*, and to exchange

change it for that of Dr. Sacheverell's Rhetorick, as some have already begun to call Bellows and Fire-Plates by the Doctor's Name: Yet this is the Man who would perswade the World that the Commons have done him a great deal of wrong, in saying, That he instills groundless Jealousies, and foment destructive Divisions among the Subjects! No certainly! this Charitable Levite pours in healing Oil, instead of Fire and Brimstone, into the Bleeding Wounds of the Nation.

We have his own Negative against the Charge of the Commons, That he excites and stirs up the Subjects to Arms and Violence. No, honest Man! he has commended her Majesties Person and Administration so much, and so unanswerably prov'd the Care that She and her Ministry takes to preserve the Constitution of Church and State, that both his Sermons are one continued Encomium upon them: Nay, he himself has done more than the Queen and all her Ministers together, he has rid the Nation at once of all those Fire-brands, False-Brethren, and other Instruments of Division, by throwing them all into Hell in a Bundle.

'Tis very unhappy for a Man when his publick Actions can be brought in Evidence against his Profession, which is plainly the Doctor's Case; and that which makes it worse, is, that as the Commons have justly charged him, in order to make the stronger Impressions on the Minds of the Subjects, he has wickedly wrested and perverted divers Texts and Passages of Holy Scripture. His Defence to this part of the Charge is so very feeble, that it perfectly shows his distrust of his own Cause. His last Recourse is to his Cloth, the common Sanctuary of bad Clergymen, when they abuse those of the Laity; but he ought to have consider'd that he is now before the Supreme-Powers, who have a right to call Clergymen as well as others to an account, for high Crimes and Misdemeanors. There's no Christian will deny that Ministers of the Gospel have a right to cite the Word of God in Exhortations and Reproofs, and when they lament the Conflicts of the Church! But with what Confidence can he offer to suggest that he did not apply those Texts to particular Persons and Things, when the contrary is so obvious through both his Sermons? Or where does he find that our Saviour, who has so expressly declar'd that his Kingdom is not of this World, gave his Ministers power to determin the Constitutions of Kingdoms, the Chief Controversies of State, to rail at Princes and Parliaments, and to accuse them with the blackest Treachery that ever was heard of to destroy both Church and State? Who made Priests Judges of the Actions, or much less of the Intentions of the Queen and Parliament,

or

or who gave them Authority to direct them in making of Laws, or what Persons they are to imploy under them ? Who gave the Doctor a Power to damn a Diocesan for joining those who took Arms against the late King *James*, and to include his Sovereign, and the whole Kingdom in the same Condemnation ? But it being high time to take leave of the Doctor, since he does not seem to be very much conversant with Scripture, I would advise him to read *Rom. 14.* but to study it better than he has done the 13. and then he will see whether the State, and our Moderate Churchmen, who made the Act of Toleration for the Ease of tender Consciences, or he that arraigns it, as pulling down the Inclosures of the Church, have been most acted by the Spirit of the Gospel ; and if he has leisure from his more important Studies, he may also read *Rom. 3.* where he will find there's a sort of Men in the World who have the Poyson of Asps under their Lips, whose Mouth is full of Cursing and Bitterness, whose Feet are swift to shed Blood, who have not known the way of Peace ; and the conclusion of all is, they have no Fear of God before their Eyes. Before the Doctor can acquit himself of this Charge, he must according to the Apostles command, *Eph. iv. 31.* put away all Bitterness, Wrath, Clamour, Anger, evil Speaking and Malice, and be kind and tender-hearted to his Brethren, and forgive them, as ever he expects that God for Christ's Sake shall forgive him.

FINIS.

4224.C.31